ESSAYS

IN

BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC CRITICISM

London
HENRY FROWDE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

New York
MACMILLAN & CO., 66 FIFTH AVENUE

STUDIA

BIBLICA ET ECCLESIASTICA

ESSAYS

CHIEFLY

IN BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC CRITICISM

BY

MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF OXFORD

VOLUME IV

Oxford
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
M DCCC XCVI

Oxford
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS.

I.

ST. PAUL AND HELLENISM[1].

[E. L. HICKS.]

—Heavenly John, and Attic Paul,
And that brave weather-battered Peter,
Whose stout faith only stood completer
For buffets.—ROBERT BROWNING, *Easter Day*.

THE Hellenizing of the world began with Alexander the Great. The victory of Greek ideas followed the conquest of his sword. What he began his successors developed; but the conception was his own. He Hellenized the world. I know some have doubted how far Alexander was conscious of the

[1] This was delivered as one of the Oxford Long Vacation Lectures for the Clergy, July 27, 1893. It is printed without alteration except the addition of one or two sentences. A review by G. Heinrici in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1894, pp. 207 foll. has brought to my knowledge an important paper by the veteran Ernst Curtius, *Paulus in Athen*, which may be found in the *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Preussischen Akademie d. Wiss. zu Berlin: Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1893, xliii. §§ 925–938. I have been unable to consult the original paper, but, to judge from the review, it goes over much the same ground as my lecture, and adopts a similar point of view. The idea that in Acts xvii. 22 the words σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου do not refer to the *hill* of the Areopagus, nor even to a formal session of the court, but to a preliminary hearing of charges made against the new teacher in the στοὰ βασίλειος, where the Areopagus had its place of business, and therefore close to the market-place,—will be found anticipated in Curtius' delightful *Stadtgeschichte von Athen*, 1891, p. 262. I have assumed in my lecture the authenticity of the thirteen Epistles, for my purpose was not apologetic. But such a view is at least more reasonable than the latest theory of certain Dutch and Swiss scholars, that none of the Epistles are Pauline; that the 'unquestioned' four emanated from the Roman Church; and that the features of the real Paul are very different from those we have dreamed of, and are to be recovered mainly from indications in he Acts. This theory is quite sufficiently stated and criticized in Mr. Knowling's *The Witness of the Epistles*, London, 1892.

revolution he was working. But look at his portrait, and you see the man of ideas as well as the man of arms, the dreamer as well as the conqueror. His tutor had been a metaphysician; he had slept with the *Iliad* under his pillow. And amid the wonderful movement of events in his brief life, as he was making history, his ideas doubtless grew as he advanced. It is always so with the greatest men; I believe it was so with St. Paul. The germinal ideas are with them at the first; their life's work is to develop and unfold them in fact.

What, then, was Hellenism? It meant (1) A breaking down of the barriers of race. We realize this in a moment when we read of the wonderful wedding-feast made by Alexander at Susa in February, 324 B.C., when he and his chief captains, to the number of nearly one hundred, all married Persian wives on one day. It was an outward and startling expression of the idea that the clash of arms was now over and done with. Henceforward the East should wed the West.

(2) Hellenism involved—as Alexander conceived it—a breaking down of the narrow politics of the Greek cities. Just after the Susa wedding-feast, he sent Nicanor to the Olympian festival of August, 324, to proclaim the return of all political exiles to their own cities throughout Greece. Thus were the old Greek political landmarks for ever swept away: the cities became merged in monarchies.

(3) Hellenism meant, further, the universal spread of Greek language and culture. I need not dwell on this topic; we shall return to it again and again.

(4) Hellenism (once more) meant a fusion of religions. Wherever Alexander went he paid reverence to the local deities. The gods of Greece followed him to Susa and Babylon, and the teeming brood of the Nile, Sarapis, Isis, Osiris, and the rest, soon learned the Greek tongue and found a home wherever Hellenism went.

Let me recapitulate these definitions. Hellenism meant (1) fusion of races, (2) unity of language, (3) union of cities

in a great monarchy, (4) religious toleration and comprehension.

These great ideas were not wholly realized in the lifetime of Alexander, nor even of his immediate successors. Much was reserved for fulfilment only under the Roman Empire. And even then Rome shrank from the task. It was left for Hadrian to speak of the Greek as the equal brother of the Roman[1]. It was reserved for a much later emperor to have it said of him:

Fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam;
Urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat.

But, long before, this fusion had been preached by St. Paul, and had been realized in the Church. Unity of government, indeed, Rome had aimed at from the first. That universal sovereignty which had been the dream of Alexander became a momentous fact in the Roman Caesar. By a marvellous system of roads and forts, only rivalled in perfection by her system of law and of provincial government, Rome organized the world in one. But while Rome could command and control and organize, she could not inspire. She did not teach others her tongue. Her decrees and laws were officially translated into Greek at Rome before their despatch to the Eastern Provinces. Still less had Rome a religion, a system of ideas or conduct to impart to her subjects.

And now let us try and grasp the significance of Hellenism in its bearing upon the Jews. In every city of the Levant, from the third century B. C., there were larger or smaller settlements of Jews. Alexander planted them in his Egyptian city; the growth of trade under the Hellenistic kings tempted thousands more into the various cities of the Mediterranean; the cruelty of the Syrian kings drove forth many thousands

[1] See an epigram of Hadrian from Ephesus, now in the British Museum (No. 539; Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca*, 888 *a*), in which a friend is praised as

Ἔξοχον Ἑλλήνων, πρόκριτον Αὐσονίων.

The phrase is highly characteristic.

more. While retaining their old beliefs, and maintaining close relations with the Temple, they spoke the Greek tongue, they adopted the Greek dress, and went as far as was possible in the direction of conformity to their Gentile neighbours. For instance, at Iasos in Caria, in an inscription of the second century B.C., I find a certain 'Niketas son of Jason, of Jerusalem,' contributing along with his Gentile neighbours to the building of the city theatre. At Alexandria the Jews were so numerous, and so thoroughly organized, that there soon came a demand for a Greek version of their Scriptures. That version was made gradually, and to meet a popular demand. But this only lends to the fact of the Septuagint a fresh significance. The very Oracles of God had been Hellenized. Nor was this process merely external. How far Hebrew ideas had been Hellenized is to be seen in Philo. In Alexandria, in the Augustan age, there were learned and devout Jews who thought as well as spoke in the Greek language. We must not forget the great readiness with which Orientals acquire a foreign tongue. Even in Palestine itself there were Hellenists who not only read their Scriptures in Greek, but who prayed also in Greek.

Note further that Alexander's conquests had shifted the centre of things. He died June 11, 323, at Babylon; he was King of Macedon, in the far West. And when, upon his death, his successors entered upon their fierce struggles for the mastery, and the tide of conflict rolled backwards and forwards between Europe and Asia, the populations of the Eastern Aegean saw the most of that *gigantomachia*. That is to say, the eastern basin of the Mediterranean is the heart and centre of Hellenism. How difficult it is to conceive of this! How little we know of the life of that part of the world (e.g.) in the third century B.C., i.e. precisely at the Hellenistic time! To realize the period, we must almost forget Athens: she is no more a factor in the problem. Other names have taken her place upon the page: Rhodes, Ephesus, Alexandria, Lysimacheia, Pergamon, Antiochs and

Seleucias more than one. Sculpture has migrated to Rhodes. Even Literature, though lingering at Athens, steps presently eastward, to Alexandria, to Cos. But alas, Literature at this stage almost deserts us. But for Theocritus (who belongs to Cos and Alexandria more than to Sicily), and but for Herodas, whose curious poems have lately appeared from an Egyptian tomb to throw a flicker of light upon this time and region, we have hardly any literary relic of the Levant of the third century B.C.[1] It is to coins, to inscriptions, and to surviving works of art that we have to turn, in order to recall the life of that forgotten epoch. But from such sources we learn very much. We learn, for example, concerning the language of Hellenism, that though its dialect is contributed in the main by Athens, yet the vocabulary, and even the inflexions, show the great influence of the current speech of the Aegean. Thus in the 'Will of Epicteta,' a third-century inscription from Thera, we find striking illustration of so important a word as *συναγωγή* for a religious meeting, and of the curious word *γλωσσόκομον* for a chest[2]. The liturgical term *καρπῶσαι* occurs there also, and in a Coan sacrificial inscription[3]. Not the Attic *μέτοικος*, but *πάροικος* (-*έω*, -*ία*) is the word for sojourner, at Ephesus and all cities of that longitude. Again, words reassume old senses which they had discarded while Attic was the dominant literary speech (*ἀπόστολος*, *κατήχησις*[4], are examples of this), just as Americanisms like 'humans' for human beings, or 'fall' for autumn, are but survivals of Elizabethan English. Examples might be multiplied indefinitely: let me sum up in a word. The Jews lived near the very centre of Hellenism. They were part of it. And Jewish religion in its expression, and even in its thought,

[1] All this I never so fully realized, as when I was trying to work out the history of the island of Cos; see *Historical Introduction to the Inscriptions of Cos*, by Paton and Hicks.

[2] *C. I. G.* No. 2448.

[3] See *Hellenic Journal*, 1888, vol. ix. p. 336.

[4] See Lightfoot on Galatians vi. 6; and his note on *ἀπόστολος*, ibid. pp. 92–3; and on *γογγυσμός*, Phil. ii. 14.

had been very largely Hellenized before the coming of the Gospel. I say, in its thought. For I do not think any idea, certainly no system of beliefs and convictions, can be translated from its native tongue into another, without detaching some elements, and assimilating others. Nor could the Jew live as a Greek, talk as a Greek, and teach and pray in Greek, without certain insensible modifications of his habits of mind. He might never be quite at home with the *indirecta oratio*, but the Greek tongue taught him logic and the possibilities of abstract thinking. And in this there is nothing to wonder at, or to regret. If Judaism, if the Gospel—which came first to man in Jewish garb—was to take lasting hold of 'the supreme Caucasian mind,' it was well that it should pass westward through the noblest conceivable medium, that of Hellenic speech and thought.

And this brings us at once to St. Paul: what was his relation to Hellenism?

1. Of course he was bred and born a Hebrew of the Hebrews. His parents, proud of their Benjamite origin, call their son Saul, after the one royal name in their tribe. After his home training is over, he is sent to Jerusalem, where he sits at the feet of Gamaliel. Until his conversion, he is of the straitest sect of the Pharisees. And at his conversion the heavenly voice speaks to his inner soul in the sacred Hebrew tongue. But St. Paul's genius was many-sided. He inherits from his father the Roman citizenship. His birthplace is Tarsus, a city second hardly to any at the time as a seat of learning: schools, chiefly of course of Rhetoric, abounded there; and philosophy, especially the Stoic, had its representatives. That is to say, Saul of Tarsus was a Hellenized Jew: he could speak 'Εβραϊστί, i.e. in Aramaic, and in Greek equally well. It is true his Greek was not that of the literary man, still less of the Attic purists. It was provincial, uneducated if you please. But it was Greek, none the less. It is an exaggeration when Renan speaks of his language being almost unintelligible to a literary

Greek. He was intelligible to the provincials whom he wanted to convince. The more educated Corinthians criticized his style (2 Cor. x. 10); it was too full of Hebraisms and Aramaisms. It had no flavour of literary Greek. But it was a real, living, spoken tongue, and that was better. He speaks it, and dictates it also, with a manifest glow of thought. It undergoes no sensible change in ten years. He does not think in Aramaic and translate into Greek. He thinks in the tongue that he speaks and writes. He has the Septuagint text by heart, though he often varies a word or phrase, to emphasize the application. In other words, Saul the Pharisee is also the Hellenist Paulus. We have no proof that he attended the Greek schools of his city. But a nature so alert and sympathetic could not be brought thus near to Hellenic influence without feeling its power. We can infer little from his quotation of a line of Menander in 1 Cor. xv. It was possibly a current quotation—like many a line from Shakespeare to-day. The same may be said of the passage from Aratus or Cleanthes cited at Athens (Acts xvii. 28), or the line of Epimenides in Titus i. 12. But if he was as unread in Greek literature as some suppose, then his careful recollection of lines so casually heard, and his remarkably apt quotation of them, betray all the more his mental leanings.

2. The same thing is evidenced by his metaphors. They are at least as much Greek as Syrian. From Syria came the 'open door,' the 'burthen borne,' and the acts of walking or building to symbolize moral ideas. But on the other hand see how essentially Greek is his perpetual employment of figures drawn from athletic games—*τρέχειν, δρόμος, καταβραβεύειν, ἀγωνίζεσθαι, πυκτεύειν, στέφανος*, and the rest. In all of which we must not think too much of Elis or Nemea, but remember that in Hellenistic and Roman times athletic festivals had become a universal passion, and every city of the Levant had Olympia of its own. Not less essentially Greek are his metaphors from the mysteries (Col. i. 26 and *passim*; Phil. iv. 12), or from civic life (Eph. ii. 12 and 19, and else-

where), or from education (παιδαγωγός, Gal. iii. 24)[1]. It is plain that St. Paul's mind is stored with images taken from Graeco-Roman life; he calls them up without effort. He returns to some of them again and again. Even when a metaphor is suggested by an Old Testament text like Isaiah lix. 17 and xi. 5, he works up the illustration (1 Thess. v. 8; Eph. vi. 13) after the manner of a pure Greek simply describing a Roman soldier. I cannot enlarge on this topic—the western character of St. Paul's images. But to illustrate my argument, contrast the favourite metaphors of St. Paul on the one hand with the strictly Syrian and rural figures of the Gospels, and on the other with the purely oriental images of the Apocalypse,—images which art cannot express in outward shape without grotesque monstrosity.

But (3), if St. Paul's figures were not usually Hebraic, neither did he derive so much as is commonly thought from Roman customs. Lightfoot points out (on Gal. iv) how St. Paul's use of νήπιος and προθεσμία does not agree with the details of Roman law. Even when he is speaking to the Romans of υἱοθεσία, the word reminds me rather of Greek than of Roman antiquities. No word is more common in Greek inscriptions of the Hellenistic time: the idea, like the word, is native Greek.

But (4) the moral teaching of St. Paul takes up into itself some of the best thoughts of Greek philosophy. The very language of Stoicism has lent itself to his service. I need say the less on this head, because of the careful and sympathetic treatment it has received from Lightfoot in a famous Appendix to his Philippians. He rightly discards the legend which brought the Apostle and Seneca into personal contact. There is no reason to suppose that St. Paul had read a page of any Stoic treatise. Ideas, like germs, are in the air, and they only

[1] Ernst Curtius, in the paper already referred to, mentions also χαίρειν (Phil. iv. 4); εὔφημοι (iv. 8); the Attic salt of Col. iv. 6; the idea of measure in 2 Cor. x. 13. All this betrays, he says, 'den Anhauch hellenischer Lebensanschauung.'

await a suitable host, to live and take effect. I know not how much Mr. Ruskin has ever read of Comte: but I know that some of his Oxford lectures, when I heard them, seemed inspired by all that is best in the Positive Ethics. Nor can I ever read 1 Cor. iv. 8, without being reminded of Stoic phrases about the philosopher-king.

(5) We pass from language and ideas to method of exposition. Here also—I speak with deference—Renan appears to exaggerate grossly when he says, 'His mode of arguing is strange in the extreme. He certainly knew nothing of the logic of the Peripatetics. His syllogism is anything but Aristotelian; on the contrary, his dialectic comes nearer to that of the Talmud.' It may be prepossession, but I find in St. Paul much to remind me of Aristotle. I never read 1 Cor. xiii, without thinking of the description of the virtues in the *Nicomachean Ethics*[1]. St. Paul's way of arguing also—making point by point, and covering his whole ground, meeting objections by anticipation, and assuming the questions of a supposed antagonist—recalls to me the method of Aristotle. I know that his style when most rhetorical never reaches the formal and even grandiose manner of the Epistle to the Hebrews: but his method of exposition is really Greek. If any one doubts this, and desires to make St. Paul's method still Hebraic, let him compare the Pauline Epistles with those of St. John or St. James. The latter circle round certain ideas; advance is made with no apparent logical sequence. St. Paul's argument is capable of obvious and minute analysis[2]. I would only point further to the systematic classification of moral obligations in Romans xii, or in Ephesians and Colossians, as being quite Hellenic in manner.

(6) St. Paul's sympathy with Hellenism is shown by his

[1] St. Paul's ethical teaching has quite an Hellenic ring. It is (1) philosophical, as resting on a definite principle, viz. our new life in Christ, and (2) it is logical, as classifying virtues and duties according to some intelligible principle.

[2] I should say that this passage was composed before Professor Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire* came into my hands.

method of travel. With quite a Greek instinct he prefers to keep in sight of the sea. The great sea-ports have an attraction for him—Antioch, Troas, Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus. He never stays in the villages, or even the minor towns, where Hellenic influence is feeble: he pushes on to the larger towns of the Roman system, that is, where Hellenism is strong. More and more he feels impelled to do so by a Divine Voice within. When he visits Europe for the first time and lands at Neapolis, he never stops until he gets to Philippi, because it 'is the chief town of that part of Macedonia and a colony.' This practice of St. Paul is finely illustrated by Prof. Ramsay in his *Church in the Roman Empire.* We had all thought that Lystra, a scene of St. Paul's earlier labours, was an out-of-the-way, uncultivated town. We must deem it so no more: it was an important city, and a Roman colony, a centre of Graeco-Roman culture. Hence its attraction for the Apostle.

(7) I pass to the growth of St. Paul's ideas. That such a growth took place few now would deny. I do not mean a change, but a development. The topics of his Epistles, the controversies that successively engaged his mind, show what that development was. First came the question of the universality of the Gospel, and the equality of races within the Church. In fighting for this principle the Apostle was, in fact, working out a fundamental idea of Hellenism, which had never yet been realized, but which was to find its realization in a glorious and divine manner, in a kingdom not of earth but of heaven, in a city whose builder and maker is God.

The second great topic that engaged him was the doctrine of the Person of Christ. This had underlain all his teaching, and each earlier Epistle. But now it assumes a prominent place, as in Phil. ii. and Col. i–iii: and its bearings upon human life and hope becomes of absorbing interest. But here again, the language which enables St. Paul to scale these heights of thought, and to set forth, once and for ever, the doctrine of

the Incarnation in its various aspects, is the language of Hellenism. Greek thought had provided for St. Paul a vocabulary, and a set of ideas as well as phrases, wherein to express his doctrine — a doctrine in no wise borrowed from Hellenic thought, but which could hardly be made intelligible to the minds of his time, or to our own minds to-day, unless Greek thought had prepared the human mind for such grand and far-reaching ideas[1]: *ὁ γὰρ φιλόσοφος συνοπτικός τις.*

There remains a third great topic of St. Paul,—the universality and the unity of the Catholic Church. This fills his Ephesian letter, and forms the climax of his life. Glance back for an instant upon that life, and see how he reached this point. Driven by the Spirit he had found his way to Europe. From Macedonia he passes to Achaia, and spends a year and a half in Corinth. From the capital of Achaia, he passes to Ephesus, and (enlarging upon his Corinthian experiment) spends nearly three years in the capital of Asia. From the capital of Asia his thoughts turn to the capital of the world: 'I must see Rome' (Acts xix. 21). Within a few months the Roman letter was despatched. More and more the marvel of that wide Empire and the majesty of sovereign Rome had become luminous ideas in his mind. And when at last—by God's strange leading—he is at the centre of the world, there Paul the captive gains his clear vision of the Catholic Church, and writes of a polity, of an organization wider than of Rome, and as enduring as God (Eph. ii. 19 foll.): 'Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints . . . Ye are built upon the founda-

[1] Let the reader compare the three passages Phil. ii, Col. i–ii, Eph. i–ii, and see how in point of philosophic grasp and expression they improve upon each other. Note further the nice use of *μορφή, σχῆμα* (Phil. ii. 6), and of the prepositions in Col. i. 16–20. From the Greek schools likewise come such words as *ὁρισθείς, νοούμενα, θειότης* (*θεότης* Col. ii. 9), *ἄφθαρτος* in Romans i, and the highly philosophical distinction between *νόμος* and *ὁ νόμος* in Romans (*passim*). Other Pauline words invite attention from a similar point of view: *σοφία, γνῶσις, ἐπίγνωσις, ξύνεσις, αἴσθησις, διανοία, φρόνησις, κ.τ.λ.*

tion of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone.' Here is the first germ of the *De Civitate Dei.*

We reach here the climax of the Apostle's life. Wisely does the author of the Acts drop the curtain at this point. All else was but the epilogue to the great drama. The theology of St. Paul was now complete; his ideas had attained their full orb. There remained nothing more than to organize, to elaborate discipline, to direct and advise. These cares occupy the Pastoral Epistles.

May I close with three general remarks?

1. Let us beware of post-dating the influence of Hellenism on Christian thought. I felt that this error really underlay the otherwise brilliant *Hibbert Lectures* of Dr. Hatch. The influence of Hellenism began in fact with the first preaching of the Gospel; and St. Paul is the foremost representative of the process. That influence was of course indirect and unconscious, and did not involve any deliberate adoption of Hellenic practices[1]: but it had been a leaven working in the Church from the first. Then later, in the fourth century, when the fabric of Graeco-Roman civilization was crumbling to its fall, the Church alone was left to rescue from that ruin

[1] We may therefore dismiss the crude suggestion of Prof. P. Gardner (*The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, 1893), that St. Paul borrowed the idea of the Eucharist from the Eleusinian Mysteries, which he may have learned about at Corinth. The writer simply ignores the testimony of the Mark-tradition to the primitive origin of the Lord's Supper, and he also mistakes the essential features of the Eleusinia. These centred in the visit of Iacchos to Demeter and Korè (this formed the πομπή), and in the mystery-play which followed (τὰ δρώμενα, hence the ἱεροφάντης). See also Gustav Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum* (1894), p. iii *n*. The value of Anrich's essay is chiefly negative. We are not to exaggerate the extent of Gentile admixture in Christian usage, nor date such accretions too early. He rightly insists (p. 106) that Hellenic worship consisted of ritual acts, whereas Christian worship gave the chief place to prayer, praise, and instruction. He points out that it was mainly in connexion with the sacraments, because they involved ceremonial acts, that Hellenic usages and beliefs found opportunity to fasten themselves on to the Christian tradition. This tendency, which developed by degrees, none will deny; see the Abbé Duchesne, *Les Origines du Culte Chrétien.*

much that humanity could ill afford to lose[1]. Swiftly therefore and surely, and with no mere blind instinct, during that age of disquiet and change, did the Church take over and consecrate to diviner uses whatever she could of the art, the letters, the ritual of the older world. We may indeed confess that her task was most difficult and delicate; we may complain that it was unskilfully done; that in art she borrowed too little, in ceremonial and in metaphysics overmuch. But I am only concerned to point out here, that this assimilation of Hellenism by the Church, this sympathy with the old Hellenic world had been a reality all along, and was involved in the very fact of the Gospel coming to the western world in the language of Greece.

2. It is vain to regret a process so inevitable, a development so natural to the human mind. It is irrational to appeal from the Nicene Creed to the Sermon on the Mount. For Christianity needs to be expressed in the language, and therefore in the thought and phrase, of mankind at whatever particular date. The thought and phrase of the Greek world of the fourth century were not the same as of Palestine in the first, nor are they the same as our own. And yet, as a matter of fact, when we want to understand the metaphysical and moral bearings of Christian doctrine, if we turn to Athanasius and Chrysostom, how fresh and modern they are! How significant the philosophy of the *De Incarnatione Verbi*, how practical the sober, ethical exegesis of the *Homilies*.

3. Perhaps one of the greatest needs of the Church in our day is that its teachers should learn the method of St. Paul; should learn how to enunciate the Gospel in the phrase and ideas of modern life. For the educated this has been endeavoured by many, and by none with more wonderful freshness and depth than by Robert Browning: witness his *Death in the Desert*, his *Easter Day*, and very much beside. For the industrial classes it certainly has not been done, save very partially, and chiefly outside of the Church. But it must

[1] This is very strikingly put in a lecture by Harnack, on St. Augustine.

be done, and can best be done by men of learning and thought. For scholarship need not lessen their sympathy with others, and culture should give them an imaginative insight into conditions not their own. The Gospel needs translating into the language of the masses; it must be brought within their range of ideas, must at least understand their prepossessions, must be recommended by illustrations taken boldly from their manner of life. This was St. Paul's method; it is worth adoption to-day: τοῖς πᾶσι γέγονα πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω (1 Cor. ix. 22).

II.

THE 'GALATIA' OF ST. PAUL AND THE 'GALATIC TERRITORY' OF *ACTS*.

[W. M. Ramsay.]

Dr. Sanday asks me to write a paper on the Galatian question. It is difficult to do so within moderate compass, and it would be absurd to do so without referring to the counter-arguments or assertions of critics (Dr. Schürer in *Theologische Litteraturztg.* 1893, Sept. 30, p. 506, correcting his article in *Jahrb. f. Protestant. Theologie*, 1892, p. 471; Dr. Chase in *Expositor*, Dec. 1893, and May, 1894; Dr. Zöckler in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1894, pp. 51–102)[1]. It is therefore necessary to use a more controversial tone than is pleasant to me, and to speak of some elementary points at disproportionate length, because the controversy concerns especially the fundamental facts and ideas upon which the whole theory rests.

If I have complied with this request, it is not because I have the hope of convincing any whose minds are already made up that the South-Galatian theory is inadmissible and impossible on grounds of grammar, or of geography, or of history. But I ask an unprejudiced hearing in the confidence that those who begin the investigation and weigh the arguments

[1] As the distinctive nomenclature used in my book has been adopted as convenient by two critics, Dr. Chase and Dr. Zöckler, it will be used in this article: 'North Galatia' will denote the territory permanently occupied by the three Galatian tribes in the third century B.C., 'South Galatia' will denote the parts of Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, and Isauria, which were included under the rule of the Roman governor of the province Galatia, and the two opposing views will be designated as 'the North-Galatian theory' and 'the South-Galatian theory.'

without that strong (all the stronger because unconscious) bias given by frequent repetition for years of a book so familiar as *Acts*, will see that the South-Galatian theory alone makes *Acts* intelligible and intelligent; and these will be a growing number as time goes on.

One difficulty which faces me is that the North-Galatian theory is professedly based on the view that *Acts* is full of 'gaps in the narrative,' i. e. omissions that offend against our sense of what is right in a history. Hence it avails not to prove that the North-Galatian theory attributes an irrational omission to *Acts*: one more gap does not dismay the theorist who is already impressed with the number of gaps. In time, however, the principle will become recognized even in the criticism of *Acts* (as it is in all extra-Biblical criticism) that the interpreter who is to make any progress must start with the belief that his author was rational, and must prefer the rational theory to the theory of irrational gaps. The concise historian of a great movement may dismiss ten years in a breath and devote a chapter to one step in his subject; but his silence is part of his method and as eloquent as his speech [1]. But any one can hold the North-Galatian theory who is ready to help it out with the gap-theory.

1. Ancient Opinion.—Asterius, bishop of Amaseia in Pontus, A.D. 401, explains the expression in Acts xviii. 23 τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν as τὴν Λυκαονίαν καὶ τὰς τῆς Φρυγίας πόλεις. The North-Galatian theorists are not free to regard these words as the mistaken theory of a late writer: such a theory could not arise in the time of Asterius, for Lycaonia was no longer included in Galatia in his time [2]. The evidence of later ecclesiastical writers is sometimes affected badly by their tendency to intrude the facts of their

[1] That *Acts* was written by a great historian of that order is the argument of my *St. Paul: the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, now nearly ready.

[2] See *Homily* VIII on *St. Peter and St. Paul*, in Migne, *Patrolog. Graec.* vol. xl. I owe this quotation to my friend and former pupil Mr. A. F. Findlay. The words of Asterius are quoted below p. 18.

own time into the past, and by their misunderstanding of the old words through want of knowledge of the old circumstances. But neither of these causes can have operated in this case; Asterius contradicts the facts of his own time; and no conceivable interpretation could get τὴν Λυκαονίαν out of τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν except the deliberate adhesion of Asterius to the South-Galatian theory. Now the circumstances of Asterius's life make him an exceptionally good witness in this case: he must have been familiar with the geography of central Asia Minor; the comparative situation of North-Galatia and Lycaonia, and the difference between the two routes open to St. Paul in Acts xviii. 23 on the two theories (North-Galatian and South-Galatian), were points on which he could not make such a mistake as to blunder into the idea that the 'Galatic Region' was 'Lycaonia.'

Asterius, then, held the South-Galatian theory; and this shows that either he had studied past history independently and carefully, and rejected the usual belief, or the usual belief and the unbroken tradition confirmed the view which he states. Now it is most improbable, and quite incongruous with the character of fourth and fifth century Christianity and Church scholarship, to suppose that any one studied such *minutiae* of early history in the scientific and independent spirit that would be required to recreate the South-Galatian theory in opposition to the traditional view; and a slight study of Asterius which I have made for the purpose does not lead to the belief that he was the man to make such an investigation with free and bold spirit. It seems clear that Asterius was brought up to the South-Galatian theory as the accepted tradition.

The commentaries of Theophylact and Chrysostom contain no clear evidence as to their belief on this point; but the South-Galatians will find their words far more intelligent than the North-Galatians. For my own part, it seems difficult to think that Chrysostom, who knew Asia Minor widely, could have said what he has said and not been struck with

the awkwardness, if he had held the North-Galatian theory, whereas, if he had been brought up in an unquestioned South-Galatian tradition, his language is clear and natural.

But the proof that Asterius spoke according to accepted tradition and not according to independent investigation is furnished by the fact that he gives expression to a traditional error in the same sentence. He says *μετῆλθεν οὖν ἐκ Κορίνθου πρὸς τὴν τῶν Πισίδων χώραν· εἶτα τὴν Λυκαονίαν καὶ τὰς τῆς Φρυγίας πόλεις καταλαβών, κἀκεῖθεν τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐπισκεψάμενος, εἶτα τὴν Μακεδονίαν, κοινὸς ἦν τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος.* Why does the *Πισίδων χώρα* come in between Corinth and Lycaonia in this account of Paul's travels from Acts xviii. 18 to xx. 1? The explanation is furnished by the corresponding passage of Euthalius, who is commonly dated c. 458 A.D., that from Corinth Paul went to Ephesus and Caesareia *εἶτα δεύτερον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας, εἶτα εἰς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν*[1] *καὶ Φρυγίαν, εἶτα πάλιν δεύτερον εἰς Ἔφεσον.* It is clear that there was a wide-spread traditional misinterpretation of Acts xviii. 22 as referring to Pisidian Antioch. Asterius was under the current mistake on this point; but, if he had made such an independent study as to strike out the South-Galatian theory for himself, he could not have remained in error about the Antioch of xviii. 22[2].

Jerome in his commentary on *Galatians* evidently believes that the letter was addressed to the three Celtic tribes; but this fact cannot weigh against Asterius. Jerome entertained without any doubt the natural thought that the Galatia of St. Paul was the Galatia of earlier and of late time.

The southern tradition had every opportunity of preserving

[1] It is noteworthy that Euthalius read in xvi. 6 *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, where Chrysostom has *τὴν Γαλατικήν*.

[2] This current error prevents us from claiming Euthalius as an unmistakable South-Galatian. It is true that the South-Galatian theory alone brings Paul to Pisidian Antioch on this journey; but Euthalius gets in Pisidian Antioch on a side-issue. He mentions this as the second visit to Pisidian Antioch: I believe it was the third; but Dr. Gifford, a South-Galatian, makes it the second visit, while Bishop Lightfoot, a North-Galatian, makes it the third.

the real line of St. Paul's journeys. On the other hand hardly a scrap of tradition remains about an early church in North-Galatia. Its history begins in the fourth century with the martyr-bishop of Ancyra, Clemens, under Diocletian [1], and the Council of Ancyra about 314. Only one other North-Galatian bishop appeared at the Ancyran Council, Philadelphius of Juliopolis; and I know of nothing else about the early North-Galatian Church. The earliest known bishop of Pessinus is Demetrius 403, of Tavium Dicasius 325, of the Troknades Cyriacus 325, of Petenissos Pius 451, of Klaneos Salomon 680, of Orcistus Domnus 431. The last four with Pessinus are in the country where, according to Dr. Zöckler, Paul planted Christianity with signal and striking success and founded several churches, yet from the supposed Pauline foundations no scrap of tradition has come down to us, no martyr (so far as I know) is recorded, only one bishop earlier than the fifth century is known. According to Dr. Zöckler Paul never saw Ancyra; yet there, and there alone in North-Galatia, do we find a slight tradition of the early Church. How has this utter oblivion affected the flourishing 'Churches of Galatia'? The only form of the North-Galatian theory that is not a historical absurdity is Lightfoot's, who held that Paul's Galatian churches were in the great cities, especially Ancyra; and Dr. Zöckler repudiates Lightfoot's theory as impossible and irreconcileable with *Acts* [2].

Contrast this with the history of the South-Galatian Churches. Peter, bishop of Iconium, at the Council of Ancyra 314, is the sixth in Le Quien's list of Iconian bishops, Eulalius in 325 the seventh [3]. Sergianus, bishop of Pisidian

[1] Theodorus of Ancyra (3rd Nov.) of unknown date is put by Le Quien before Clemens.

[2] It is noteworthy that the North-Galatians are as widely at variance with each other as they are with me. Lightfoot would have rejected unhesitatingly Zöckler's idea that Paul devoted his time to founding churches in the wilderness of the Axylon (Troknades and similar villages) and at Pessinus. But Dr. Zöckler gravely and seriously assigns this as Paul's sphere of work.

[3] The first, Sosipater, is quoted not merely from Rom. xvi. 21, but also on a tradition in some *Menologia*, which perhaps has independent ground.

Antioch at the Council of Ancyra, is the fifth in Le Quien's list. Several very early traditions are connected with Lystra [1], and still more with Iconium and Antioch.

I have made no special search in any of these cases. I take the well-known superficial evidence; but it is all in favour of the view that tradition and history would preserve some record of a group of flourishing Pauline churches. In these churches of South-Galatia, the correct tradition of Paul's journeys was perpetuated until at least the fifth century.

The burden of proof has hitherto been laid on the South-Galatian theorists, but these facts show that it is the North-Galatians who seek to overturn the early tradition and are bound to prove their view.

In the next place we turn to the history of the name and the province Galatia, and try to determine what was the exact situation in South-Galatia about 50 A.D. In my book, such points as the extent of the name Galatia, the use of 'Galatae' in the sense of 'men of the province Galatia,' the boundary close to Derbe, the large *regnum Antiochi*, the vigour of Roman policy in the country, the contempt felt by Romans and *coloniae* and loyal provincials for the appellation 'Lycaones,' not to mention others, were taken as well known [2]. I fancied that even a slight acquaintance with the antiquities of Asia Minor and the Roman imperial administration would show any reader or critic what were the grounds on which these assumptions rested [3]. In writing about St. Paul one does not expect to begin with a series of arguments on each point of history, geography, and antiquities

[1] The story of Thekla mentions it. Artemas or Artemius first bishop *Act. Sanct.* 20th June, p. 67; Eustochius under Maximian, *Act. Sanct.* 23rd June, p. 472 (he was earlier than the reorganization by Diocletian in 295, for Lystra still was governed from Ancyra in his time). Of Derbe alone I find no trace outside of the New Testament till we come down to the fourth century.

[2] A brief excursus was added, p. 13 f., as an afterthought in view of Dr. Schürer's article *Zft. f. Prot. Theol.* 1892, p. 471 f.

[3] The reasons for my statements can in great part be got in my *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*; but will, I hope, be more easily and in fuller form found in the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*.

that has to be touched. One must assume a little; and one expects that a critic who differs will investigate at least the collected and readily accessible evidence before denying these assumptions. Several points of this list, however, have been already disputed. Dr. Schürer denied the first point, but desisted when his attention was called to the contemporary geographers Pliny and Ptolemy; but Dr. Cheetham still maintains the attack [1]. The second is contradicted by Dr. Schürer and Dr. Blass; the second and the last are disputed by Dr. Zöckler, and the others are just as likely to be controverted.

2. GALATIA THE NAME OF THE ROMAN PROVINCE. Probably no one dreamed of questioning the correctness of the term 'Galatia' as applied to the whole Roman province until 1892. Historians from Tacitus to Mommsen used the term unquestioningly. But in 1892 Dr. Schürer, on the ground that a number of inscriptions in honour of governors of the province enumerate the various districts composing the province, and do not name it by a single name, hastily concluded that it was not correct to use the single name for the whole, and that therefore Paul could not have used the term 'Galatia' except in the sense of North-Galatia [2]. Prof. Mommsen, who had edited most of these inscriptions, and thought over every problem connected with them, had not been thereby deterred from applying the term 'Galatia' to the province; and all those who have studied the Asia Minor inscriptions are familiar with the vainglorious use of terms, which applied the title, governor of Phrygia, Paphlagonia, &c., to officers who ruled only a small part of Phrygia and Paphlagonia [3].

[1] Dr. Zöckler is not so determined as Dr. Cheetham; he at least has looked into Pliny and Ptolemy, and in a footnote, p. 92, grants the cogency of their authority; but even he still devotes several pages of his text to arguing that Paul was not likely to speak of 'Galatia' as the seat of his churches in Iconium, &c.

[2] *Jahrb. f. Protestant. Theologie*, 1892, p. 471, and *Theolog. Litteraturztg.* 1892, p. 468.

[3] *CIL* iii. 312, 318, are not honorary inscriptions, but the reason for the form adopted in them is explained below (see p. 39). The very order used in

As soon as Dr. Schürer's attention was directed to the ancient geographers, Pliny and Ptolemy, he recognized that he could no longer maintain his contention, and in the most scholarly spirit he at once retracted it[1]. It would have seemed sufficient to mention this and to pass to the next point. But his brief retractation seems to have escaped the attention of many who have been carried away by the apparently exhaustive erudition of his first article; and even such a careful and learned scholar as Dr. Cheetham has written in the *Classical Review*, November, 1894, to express his belief in the convincing nature of Dr. Schürer's arguments, and his sense of my inability to meet them. It is therefore better to briefly state the reasons which make it necessary to admit that the Romans habitually denominated the province 'Galatia' simply.

Ptolemy arranges his chapters according to the Roman provincial divisions: v. 1. Πόντου καὶ Βιθυνίας θέσις: v. 2. τῆς ἰδίας Ἀσίας θέσις; v. 3. Λυκίας θέσις: v. 4. Γαλατίας θέσις. He states that Galatia is bounded on the south by Pamphylia and on the north by the Euxine sea[2], including in it Pisidia on the south, and Paphlagonia on the north; he enumerates the parts of which it consisted, Paphlagonia, Pisidia, &c.; and he mentions Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra as cities of Galatia. So also in describing Pamphylia, he says it is bounded by Galatia on the north.

Again, Pliny, v. 146–7, gives an account of Galatia (*dicendum videtur et de Galatia*): he says it reaches to Cabalia of Pamphylia and the Milyae; he declares that it contained 195 peoples and tribes (whereas Galatia proper contained three

them is sufficient to show that the form is not a purely official title; first the official title *provinciarum Galatiae Cappadociae* (the two provinces united under one ruler, see the exposition in the latter part of this section), then the enumeration of parts of Galatia, viz. *Ponti, Paphlagoniae*, &c., and then the additional part of Cappadocia, viz. *Armeniae Minoris*.

[1] *Theolog. Litteraturzeitung*, 1893, Sept. 30, p. 506.

[2] I pass over the fact that Ptolemy makes some errors in details: the only point that concerns us is his belief as a scientific geographer that the term Γαλατία was properly used to denote the Roman province as a whole.

peoples divided into twelve tetrarchies); and he mentions among its cities Lystra, and other places in the Phrygian, Pisidian, and Paphlagonian districts [1].

So, again, Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 9, says: *Galatiam et Pamphyliam provincias Calpurnio Asprenati regendas Galba permiserat*: Dr. Zöckler acknowledges the force of this passage.

These passages show that 'Galatia' was freely and correctly used to denote the Roman province. No one who reads them over can hesitate on this point. The inference drawn from the inscriptions by Drs. Schürer and Cheetham is wrong, and the inscriptions are guided in their peculiar terminology not by consideration of strict accuracy, but by magniloquence. It is indeed hard to see how Dr. Schürer could seriously maintain that the official name of a Roman province was 'Galatia, Pisidia, Phrygia, Paphlagonia, Lycaonia, Pontus Galaticus, Pontus Polemonianus.' The Romans were a practical and business-like people.

It is true that in some cases Roman official custom employed a compound term to denote a single province: thus 'Bithynia-Pontus' and 'Lycia-Pamphylia' were the regular forms. The Romans continued to feel that each of these provinces contained two separate parts joined together, and it is certain that in both cases a certain distinction was maintained between the parts, even under the joint administration. Thus we have the titles Bithyniarch and Pontarch, and there is reason to think that the titles Λυκίων τὸ ἔθνος and Λυκιάρχης did not extend to Pamphylia [2]. Again, it is quite certain that when Cappadocia and Galatia were united under the Flavian emperors, the combined name was officially required, and that the two when united were even not called a single province, for in inscriptions we commonly find *provinciae* in the plural.

[1] The passage is discussed in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (1895), p. 318 f.

[2] The fact that Ptolemy gives Lycia and Pamphylia in separate chapters shows that he considered them two provinces under one administrator like Galatia-Cappadocia between 78 and 106 A. D.

That was therefore a case in which two separate provinces were placed temporarily under one head, and is markedly different from the case of Bithynia-Pontus, which is a single province with a double name.

There is at least one case in which a triple name was officially applied to a single province, viz. Syria-Phoenice-Cilicia. That these constituted one single province during the first century is shown by the provincial festival *κοινὸς Συρίας Φοινίκης Κιλικίας*, which united the three parts in the worship of the Emperors and in the feeling of Roman patriotism. But such a name was found to be too cumbrous, and the single name Syria was commonly applied to the whole. Cilicia was after a time separated from that province, and hence it is not often included under the single name, but it is common in the second and third centuries to apply the term 'Syria' to the whole territory administered by the Roman governor. Hence Phoenice and Palaestina were merged in Syria, and the usage became stronger as time passed to treat them as parts of Syria, and to employ such terms as Συρία Παλαιστίνη and Σύρος Ἀσκαλωνείτης Παλαιστείνη (Kaibel, *Inscr. Graec. in Ital.* &c., 1661)[1]. Even in the case of Cilicia, we find in a Gaulish inscription κ. Ἀδδάνων τῆς Συρίας[2]. In *CIG* 5875 b Τι. Ἰούλιος Σύρ(ος)[3], who makes a dedication to the goddess of Magarsos (the harbour of Mallos), was in all probability a native of Mallos taking the general provincial ethnic among Italian surroundings.

Syria is a name applied (in Dr. Schürer's phrase) *a parte potiori*: the name of the 'predominant partner' was applied for convenience to the whole partnership. In the strictest sense, it is incorrect; but in names usage is everything, and

[1] In this case the man (a soldier of the praetorian guard) calls himself Σύρος.

[2] Quoted by Le Blant, *Inscr. Chrét. de la Gaule*, i. p. 328, from t. III Gorii *Etr.* p. xxxvi (inaccessible to me): probably same as Kaibel no. 2306.

[3] Kaibel puts it among the 'false or suspected' no. 70: and it depends on Ligorio's testimony alone. But there is nothing suspicious in the inscription; rather its peculiarities are such as were not likely to occur to a forger, and tell in favour of its authenticity. All Ligorio's inscriptions are not spurious by any means; though those that rest only on his authority are always suspicious.

when a name, however incorrect in origin, becomes usual, it becomes correct. Hence, even though the name Galatia were simply that of the predominant partner applied loosely to the whole province, we have in the case of Syria a proof that the name *a parte potiori* might become habitual for the whole province, and the ethnic connected with the name might be accepted by the whole people. But I go much further than this. I maintain that the name Galatia was used officially from the beginning to denote the whole province, that the intention of Roman policy was to override all tribal differences and to force a Roman unity, under a single name, on the province, that this scheme was urged with all the power of Rome, and that the use of the Roman name was in itself a proof of attachment to the Roman policy. I fully grant that the attempt was ultimately a failure, that the native names outlived the Roman name, that the expansive power of the old Roman idea grew weaker towards the end of the first century, while the spirit of individuality and attachment to national characteristics grew stronger, and that Hadrian consciously and intentionally and wisely modified the Roman idea, so as to bring it more into alliance with the native character in the different countries. But in the time of Paul the old Roman policy was still vigorous, the people of Iconium called their country the Γαλατικὴ Ἐπάρχεια (*CIG* 3991), and it was a mark of loyalty and Roman spirit to use the Roman provincial designation [1].

Moreover it is highly probable that the inclusion of Iconium and Lystra in Galatia is much older than the creation of the Roman province; and in § 4 the facts are arrayed to show that the district round those cities was organized as one of the twelve divisions of the Galatian state (tetrarchies).

The words of the *Menologion Sirletianum* on Sept. 28 (*hi*

[1] That is of course perfectly consistent with using the city-ethnic, as Paul does to the people of Thessalonica. He would doubtless have addressed the congregation of Antioch alone, as 'Men of Antioch'; but the only common address possible for those of Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra, was 'Men of the province Galatia' (see § 6).

S. Martyres fuerunt sub Diocletiano imp. in urbe Antiochiae Pisidiae ex regione Phrygiae Galaticae[1] *sub praeside Magno*) contain the term *Phrygia Galatica*, and are explicable only on the South-Galatian view: this late authority retains a scrap from some early and good authority, written when Antioch was in Phrygia Galatica. Here we find the proof complete in itself, even without any corroboration, that the South-Galatian interpretation of Acts xviii. 23 and xvi. 6 is true to facts, and at the same time a proof of a genuine old martyr-fragment in a late document.

The following identification is doubtful, but it seems to deserve mention. In *CIG* 4006, found at Iconium, Aurelia Rufina of the village Golia or Golie is mentioned. In *CIG* 9764, found at Rome, Dokimos is said to belong to the village Goloe of Little (i. e. as Kirchhoff explains, Asiatic as distinguished from European) Galatia. The two villages are probably the same, and the exact situation was in Lycaonia, in the province Galatia, not very far from Iconium. If this is correct, we have a native of a village near Iconium defining his home simply as in Galatia[2].

3. GALATAE THE INHABITANTS OF THE ROMAN PROVINCE GALATIA. Now we come to the second question, Could the people of the entire province Galatia be called Galatae? or, in other words, Could the term Galatae be used in the sense 'inhabitants of the province Galatia'? Dr. Schürer, when he abandoned the first line of defence, retired to this one, saying, *Völlig undenkbar scheint es mir, dass Paulus, wenn er an Leute in Pisidien und Lykaonien geschrieben hätte, diese als* Γαλάται *angeredet haben sollte.*

[1] *Galaciae* in MS.: *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. 28, p. 563 (where this beautiful antique touch is misunderstood). Some will prefer *Galatiae*.

[2] I count this example doubtful, not because one need hesitate to identify Golie and Goloe, but because 'Little Galatia' was used occasionally in the years following 396 in the sense of the newly-instituted division Galatia Salutaris (according to its far commoner name). But Kirchhoff is (as I believe) right. The Roman inscription is certainly Christian, and might perhaps be as early as the third century.

When the distinguished historian wrote this sentence, it is difficult to think that he had looked into the evidence[1]. I can hardly believe that any one who looks into the facts will deliberately maintain, that in any case where the Romans designated one of their provinces by a single name, they thought themselves debarred from using the derived ethnic to indicate the people of the province. Yet Dr. Blass uses a similar argument, *gravius autem errarunt qui Galatas Pauli intellegi voluerunt Lycaonas, quippe qui a Romanis Galatiae provinciae essent attributi, neque enim (ut mittam alia) ea re ex Lycaonibus Galli facti erant* (xvi. 6). His argument assumes that the word Galatae could not be employed by the Romans except on the ground of hereditary descent from the Gallic invaders of Asia Minor. Neither Dr. Schürer nor Dr. Blass gives any reason for distinguishing Roman usage in this province from their usage in other provinces; and therefore we must suppose that they take the rule as universal for all the provinces, and that they believe that the ethnics connected with the names of Roman provinces were not used except on the ground of blood and descent. As almost every Roman province contained peoples of different stock and race, Dr. Schürer and Dr. Blass seem to be maintaining that the Romans were hardly ever able to express the idea 'inhabitant of a province' except by a circumlocution.

I venture to maintain, on the contrary, that to the Roman mind provincial division outweighed all other considerations such as blood or descent, that the Romans habitually divided their provinces according to convenience of administration with utter disregard of racial limits[2]; and that they regularly used the ethnic connected with the name of the province to denote the inhabitants of the province, when purposes of classification and definition required such a term.

[1] His expression is noteworthy: he gives no reason and states no corroborating fact.

[2] Strabo, p. 629, complains of the difficulty caused to the geographer by the Roman disregard for national distinctions, τὸ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φῦλα διελεῖν.

I should have thought that any one who considered what was the character of the Roman policy in subject countries would recognize at once the truth of this statement: the Roman classification and the Roman appellation were to be imposed on each Roman province. While it was necessary for the sake of clearness to use the recognized geographical terms on many occasions, yet, in all cases where classification or general definition was intended, the Roman policy prescribed the use of the Roman provincial names. It is involved in this policy that the whole population of a province should be designated by the ethnic derived from the provincial name, and that this designation should overrule all differences of nationality or local pride. The Roman unity was deliberately intended to destroy the old national differences within the province. Thus, for example, the Phoenicians of Carthage despised the natives of Africa, treated them as a conquered and enslaved caste, and scorned the name *African*. But the Roman policy intentionally comprehended all inhabitants of the province Africa under the name *Afri*. So also the Greek cities of Sicily pointedly distinguished themselves from the *Siculi* or native non-Greek tribes of the island; but the Romans classed the entire population for administrative purposes and in general definitions as *Siculi*. Similarly we can have no doubt that the Greeks of the Greek colonies in Spain and Gaul, and the Carthaginians in Spain, prided themselves on their difference in nationality from the native Spanish or Gaulish tribes; but a Roman ruler, or any person who spoke from the Roman point of view, summed all up in the provincial designation. Of course, the distinctions of local pride were long maintained, and often appear even in Roman writers. The same writer, who at one time and from one point of view summed up the population of *Sicilia Provincia* as *Siculi*, would at another time and for another purpose pointedly emphasize the Greek character of the people in Syracuse or Messana.

The following examples, which might easily be multi-

plied[1], justify the use of the proper ethnic in regard to some provinces, where strong diversities of race and name are obvious.

Afri, the whole population of the province Africa; Juvenal, viii. 120; Pliny, *Epist.* ii. 11, 2.

Siculi, the population of Sicily; Cicero, *Verr.* ii. 13, 32, *Att.* xiv. 12, 1.

Hispani, the population of Roman Spain; *saepissume.*

Bithyni, the population of Bithynia; Pliny, *ad Traj.* 79; Gaius, *Instit.* i. 193.

Baetici, the whole population of Hispania Baetica; Pliny, *Epist.* iii. 9 (*et saepe*).

Even *Narbonenses* (though so specially appropriated to the narrow and proper sense, 'citizens of Narbo'), is sometimes used in the wider sense of 'the people of the province Gallia Narbonensis' (e.g. Orosius, i. 2, 62 and 70)[2].

Now let us take a case where the region which became a Roman province had no unity and no connected geographical consistence, previous to the time when it was made a Roman province.

The Aquitani were only one of a great number of tribes in South-western Gaul; yet a large region, which was made a Roman province, was called after them *Gallia Aquitanica*[3]. Here we have to deal with a purely Roman unity introduced among a set of diverse tribes. But the name *Aquitania*[4] was applied to the province; and the name Aquitani was used not only of the single tribe, but also of the whole population of the province. The latter usage gradually became more

[1] I have not tried to find out examples, but simply quote some which are familiar to me, consulting De Vit on Tarraconensis, Lugudunensis, Narbonensis, and some other names.

[2] De Vit, *Onomast.*, says in reference to the adjoining province *Lugdunenses tum incolae civitatis Lugduni, tum etiam Lugdunensis provinciae*; but his examples (Vopiscus, *Procul.* 13, Sidon. *Ep.* 1, 8) are insufficient. He says rightly also, *Narbonenses incolae tum urbis tum provinciae.*

[3] Compare the use of *Galaticus* in *Φρυγία Γαλατική, Πόντος Γαλατικός, Γαλατικὴ χώρα, Γαλατικὴ ἐπαρχία.*

[4] Compare the use of Galatia for the whole province.

common than the old stricter and narrower use. Finally, there occur even such expressions as *Bituriges Aquitani*, though Strabo, p. 191 [1], pointedly insists on the diversity of race between the Bituriges and the Aquitani [2].

The fact is that genealogical terms and ideas were used far more loosely in ancient times than with us; and even so late as the imperial time in the Roman provinces the genealogical fiction tended to grow up. We find the term ἔθνος used not merely of the population of Lycia, where diversity of race (though real) was not so patent, but also of the people of Asia who belonged to almost as many and as diverse races as the people of Galatia. An inscription of Ephesus (*Inscr. Brit. Mus.* CCCCLXXXVII) uses the expression τοῦ ἔθνους τοὺς ἡγεμόνας, 'the governors of the province Asia,' just as the Lykiarchai are termed ἄρχοντες τοῦ Λυκίων ἔθνους, 'archons of the population of the province Lycia' (Le Bas and Wadd. no. 1219). Again at Aphrodisias we find the expression ἐν τῷ τῆς 'Ασίας ἔθνει (*CIG* 2802). In fact ἡ 'Ασία τὸ ἔθνος translates the Latin *Asia provincia* (cp. Dion. Cass. liv. 30).

There is one difference between Asia and Galatia: the province Asia had a far longer history than the province Galatia, and there was more time for usage to harden in the case of Asia. But in all other respects these provinces stand in remarkably close analogy to one another: both grew out of a pre-existing kingdom bequeathed to the Romans by its king, and both contained a great number of separate countries and races. And just as the name Galatia in the larger sense failed ultimately to permanently establish itself as a geographical entity, so also did the name Asia fail. When about A.D. 295, the province Asia was broken up after more than

[1] Where he reckons them among ἔθνη προσκείμενα τοῖς 'Ακυϊτανοῖς.

[2] The same corps which is sometimes termed *cohors I Biturigum* is at other times termed *cohors I Aquitanorum Biturigum*, i.e. the cohort raised among the inhabitants of the province Aquitania (in the special district of the Bituriges). [The term *cohors I Biturigum* is inferred from *Cohors II Biturigum*; the terms *coh. Aquitanorum*, *coh. Biturigum*, and *coh. Aq. Bit.* are hard to distinguish.]

four centuries of existence, the previous names Lydia, Phrygia, Caria, were at once resumed; and the name 'Asia' died the moment the Roman unity was dissolved; or rather it began a new life as the designation of a new Roman province containing parts of Lydia, and Mysia and Caria, with the Ionian and Aeolic coasts.

It is therefore natural to expect that the provincial name *Galatia* and the ethnic *Galatae*, Γαλάται, should have the same history as *Asia* and *Asianus*; and that their extension should vary exactly according to the limits of the province. Now we find (*CIG* 6541) Λ. Ἀντωνίῳ Ὑακίνθῳ Λαοδικεῖ τῆς Ἀσίας[1], 'to Lucius Antonius Hyacinthus, a man of Laodicea of Asia,' and in 6626, Οὐαλερία Ὀλυμπιάς, Ἀσιανὴ ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, 'Valeria Olympias, an Asian from Laodicea[2]'; and I do not see how we can resist the evidence that, when a city was reckoned to the province Asia, the inhabitants were entitled to use, and did sometimes use, the ethnic appellation 'Asian.' Those who deny that *Galatae* can be used in the same way as *Asiani* ought to prove their case, and not simply to assume it.

It must be conceded, and in trying to understand the complex political problems of western Asia Minor, it has to be carefully observed, that few cases occur where the natives of Asia apply the Roman expression Ἀσιανός to themselves. There were of course so many more cases where descent and actual birthplace had to be expressed by an individual than those in which his province had to be expressed, that there is not so much opportunity for using Ἀσιανός or Γαλάτης in the provincial sense. But, apart from this, it seems clear that the natives used these terms in the Roman sense chiefly or solely when they were amid Roman surroundings or desired to lay some stress on the Roman idea. When Paul addressed his converts in Iconium, &c. as 'Galatae,' he was speaking as

[1] Cp. *CIG* 6512 Π. Ἀλφῆνος Μαρτιάλης Λαοδικεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας and *CIG* 6478 Λαδικὺς (!) τῆς πρὸς Λύκον. These exemplify the many possible variations.

[2] The woman is so styled by her own family.

a Roman citizen to members of the Roman empire; he was really taking the Roman side in the social, educational, and political problems of the country; and he was giving to the idea of the Universal Church a form which it preserved and made fixed (only too firmly fixed!) in the following centuries[1]. Moreover the formal address is to 'the churches of Galatia;' once he slips into the address 'Galatae' in a peculiar apostrophe (see *Church in Rom. Emp.* p. 43).

Since few cases occur where a native of the province Asia calls himself Ἀσιανός (though they are quite enough to prove the usage and show its character), we cannot expect to find many examples of the word Galatae (Γαλάται) applied to the natives of the whole province, which did not last so long as Asia; but there are a few. A single case like Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 6, 5, *Pontica et Galatarum Cappadocumque auxilia*, is a complete answer to the above-quoted statements of Dr. Schürer and Dr. Blass[2].

Again, St. Gregorius Magnus, *Dialog.* iv. 38[3], says, *Est etiam nunc apud nos Athanasius Isauriae presbyter qui in diebus suis Iconii rem terribilem narrat evenire. Ibi namque ut ait quoddam monasterium* τῶν Γαλατῶν *dicitur, in quo quidam monachus magnae distinctionis habebatur.* ἔστι δὲ καὶ νυνὶ παρ' ἡμῖν πρεσβύτερός τις ὀνόματι Ἀθανάσιος ἐκ τῆς χώρας Λυκαονίας γενόμενος πόλεως δὲ τοῦ Ἰκονίου, ὅστις πρᾶγμα φοβερὸν ἐκεῖσε ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι διηγεῖτο οὕτω λέγων ὅτι μοναστήριον αὐτόθι ὑπῆρχε τῶν Γαλατῶν λεγόμενον. The Greek, as Mr. Prendergast says on the authority of Dr. Bright, is a translation made about a century later from the Latin original. Athanasius is described in *Ep.* vi. 66, p. 842 (Migne, iii. 850) as *presbytero monasterii Sancti Mile cui est vocabulum Tamnaco quod in Lycaonia est provincia constitutum.*

[1] See my article in *Expositor*, July, 1895, on *Forms of Classification in Acts.* I hope soon to work out this view in an account of Paul's work in the eastern provinces.

[2] Cp. *Ann.* xiii. 35, 4 *habiti per Galatiam Cappadociamque dilectus.* In both cases it is beyond doubt that levies from the provinces are described.

[3] I am indebted for this reference to Rev. J. M. Prendergast, Oxford.

In the time of Gregory Iconium was no longer in the province Galatia, but in Lycaonia (which was constituted a province in A.D. 374); but it seems improbable that a monastery τῶν Γαλατῶν should have been founded near Iconium, unless there had been some recognized connexion between Iconium and the Galatae, and this connexion will be described in § 6.

The κοινὸν Γαλατῶν founded in the time of Augustus was in all probability an association of the whole province in the worship of the emperors and the spirit of loyalty to the state[1]. To confine the association to a part of the province would defeat the purpose of Roman policy by recognizing and perpetuating a division. Moreover, it is impossible to suppose that one of the twelve tetrarchies was left out of the *Commune Galatarum*; and I shall in § 6 try to prove that the district of Lystra and Iconium was long recognized as one of the tetrarchies. If this proof is successful, I believe it will have to be admitted that that district formed part of the association which delighted in the name of Galatae. Apollonia, which was situated in the same district as Pisidian Antioch, but still further away from Galatia proper, built a temple similar to that at Ancyra, and engraved on it the

[1] The statements in this paragraph are all mere probabilities: none can as yet be proved on distinct and conclusive evidence of inscriptions; but they are worth making, in order to suggest the direction in which evidence may be sought. It is, however, certain that the Romans often allowed a previously existing κοινόν of part of a province to survive, e. g. in Asia the κοινὸν τῶν ιγ' πόλεων and the κοινὸν τοῦ Ὑργαλέων πεδίου. The κοινὸν Φρυγίας cannot be quoted as an example. It is argued in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, vol. ii. ch. xi (with Mommsen's approval), that the κοινὸν Φρυγίας was a society of Romans resident in Phrygia.

M. Perrot, *Explor. Arch. de la Galatie*, i. p. 199, thinks that the existence of a κοινὸν Λυκαόνων proves the existence of a series of κοινά for each nation. But he has not observed that this κοινὸν Λυκαόνων belongs to a later period, when the *Regnum Antiochi* had been incorporated in the empire; and it is pointed out in my *Histor. Geogr.* p. 377, that the Lycaonian Koinon was probably not instituted until the Triple Eparchy, Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia, was formed by Antoninus Pius. This Eparchy is a good example of the difference from 'Galatia': the compound province is always called 'the three Eparchies,' and we find such a phrase as μητρόπολις τῶν γ' ἐπαρχιῶν.

same inscription, viz. the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti.* It is probable that this temple was a foundation of the Κοινὸν Γαλατῶν in pursuance of the same patriotic and romanizing scheme as the Ancyran temple.

Again, we have at Apollonia a Greek dedicatory inscription dated probably A. D. 56, in which the dedicant declares his *patris*, i. e. Apollonia, to be in the land of the Galatians. If my interpretation is correct, this inscription is conclusive; but we cannot begin with proper advantage to discuss it until we have gone more carefully into the history of the province Galatia (see § 6).

4. ESTIMATE OF THE DESIGNATIONS, 'LYCAONIAN,' 'PISIDIAN,' &c. The question must be answered by those who take Prof. E. Schürer's side, By what term could Paul address his converts of Iconium, Lystra, &c., collectively, if he was not to term them Galatians? They themselves called the official who was administering them about A. D. 54 'procurator of the Galatic province'[1]; by what general term would the procurator address the population under his charge? Surely not as 'Phrygians and Lycaonians and Pisidians and Milyae and Orondeis, and so on.' Dr. Schürer can hardly believe that there was no common designation by which a Roman official could comprehend the provincials under his charge; yet if he denies that the common designation of the provincials was '*Galatae*,' *men of the province*, he asserts that there was not any even theoretical unity in the province, and that it was considered by the Romans themselves to be a mere congeries of alien scraps, whose people they could not designate by any term which included them all and them alone. I cannot believe that Dr. Schürer meant this. He would surely allow that a Roman governor could issue an edict comprehending the whole population of his province as *Galatae*, and excluding all who were not of the province, as Tacitus does *Ann.* xv. 6, 5.

But if the Roman officer and the historian could use the

[1] *CIG* 3991.

term, why could not the Roman Paul? Was there any other unity under which Derbe and Antioch and Iconium could be summed up except the Roman unity? There was none. Was there any other term by which the Roman unity could be designated in their case except the common province? There was none: they were not *cives Romani*, and therefore they had no footing in the Roman state except as *provinciales*. Do the North-Galatian theorists commit themselves to the declaration that Paul would not write to his four churches as a group, that he would not regard them as a unity? And, if they shrink from that extreme, what unity do they consider that Paul found in them, and by what designation would he bring out that unity?

The North-Galatian theorists ignore Paul's Roman character entirely; they apparently do not even think what must have been his surroundings and upbringing in the house of a Roman citizen, nor how powerful an influence this must have exerted on him. In fact, many of the so-called historical investigations into Paul's life and attitude and views are written by critics who seem not to have realized even the elementary fact that he must have had a Roman *praenomen* and *nomen*, and that *Paulus* was only his *cognomen*. It is quite pardonable in the school of investigation which accepts Paul as essentially a religious personality, known to us by evidence of higher character than ordinary historical documents, to ignore Paul's *civitas*; but among the critics who profess to stand on the platform of pure historical investigation, it is simply astounding to read the disquisitions on his names *Paulus* and *Saul*: I know no treatise on Paul in which even an attempt is made to determine from the inscriptions what was the meaning of the alternative name in eastern provincial society (still less what was the triple aspect, and what meant the triple name, of a person in a grecized province as (1) Roman with *tria nomina*, (2) Greek with a Greek name (usually the cognomen)[1], (3) member of

[1] It must always be borne in mind that the eastern Roman provinces were

an ἔθνος, whether Hebrew or other, with an alternative name).

I formerly asserted, and I now repeat, that, even if Paul had been addressing his Antiochian congregation alone, it would have been an insult to address them as either 'Pisidians' or 'Phrygians[1].' Dr. Zöckler devotes several pages, 95 f., to the expression of his opinion that my assertion is false, and that it has misled me into extremes which in his estimation are quite extraordinary.

My standpoint is this: the national appellations, *Lycao*, *Phryx*, &c., were essentially extra-Roman, and placed the person thus designated outside the bounds of the Roman state. Thus, for example, they were characteristic names for slaves. The geographical terms, Phrygia, &c., were necessary; but the national appellative was a reproach. Such was the legal and theoretical point of view: in practice there were exceptions, for the Roman empire was as much a natural growth, and shared as much in the necessary illogicalities of development, as the English race. The best way to test my statement is, of course, the epigraphic; and I am fortunately able to avoid the tedium of an examination, by quoting Mommsen. He has examined with his characteristic thoroughness and legal precision the Roman usage in designating soldiers of the *legiones*, the *auxilia*, and the *classiarii*, and has laid down the principles regulating the variation between the national designation[2], *Arabus*, *Afer*, *Cilix*, *Cappadox*, *Dalmata*,

recognized by the state as bilingual, Greek being allowed and used as a legal language; hence Greek nomenclature comes in as a complicating element.

[1] I have pointed out that Pisidian Antioch was not a Pisidian city but πρὸς Πισιδίᾳ (*Church in R. Emp.*, p. 26; *Strab.* pp. 557, 577, who says it was in the country of the Phrygians, p. 569); but Dr. Zöckler still maintains that its inhabitants were Pisidians. In reality there is evidence that the population counted themselves in origin as *Magnetes*, i.e. Greeks; and that the name 'Pisidian' would on this ground also (apart from the pride of a Roman *colonia*) have offended them.

[2] He expressly recognizes that the national and the provincial designations often have the same form, e.g. *Hermes*, 1884, p. 33 *Keineswegs handelt es sich hier um Angabe der Provinz, wenn auch in manchen Fällen, wie bei Sardus, Corsus, Thrax, Dalmata, Landschaft und Provinz zusammenfallen.*

Grecus, Bithynus, Phryx, Ponticus, Pamphylus, Aegyptius, Libycus, Germanus, Sardus, &c., and the designation either by province or by city (as one of the units [1] composing the province). He points out that in the view of the Roman state and law, the national designation is the servile designation. Hence it is used for the *classiarii*, as those troops were originally servile in character and standing. The designation by city or province or unit underlying the province could not be used for a slave or for a horse, nor in strict usage was it applied to a *classiarius*: the slave had no city and no *pater*, and only a geographical designation expresses the place from which he has come: we find race-horses called *Cappadox* and *Afer*, and slaves and *classiarii* called *Afer, Phryx, Syrus, Lycao* [2].

It may be well to quote a few words from Mommsen, l. c., on this point, as it is a complete justification of my statement which seems so wrong to Dr. Zöckler. *Wenden wir uns dazu, den rechtlichen Werth der Heimathangabe mittelst der Landschaft zu erörtern, so hängt sie ohne Zweifel an der ursprünglichen Unfreiheit der Flottensoldaten (classiarii). Unfreie Leute haben eine Heimath im Rechtssinne nicht: aber die Herkunft als ein factisches Verhältniss wird auch bei den Sklaven angegeben*, &c. (see *Hermes*, 1884, p. 35 f.). He had been guided to this principle by a long examination of facts and details, which he summed up thus, '*Also in dem Kreise des Classiarier hat die Heimathangabe nach der Landschaft ihren eigentlichen Sitz, und hier allein tritt sie als allgemeine und feste Norm auf* (l. c., p. 33).

[1] Where the province was made of cities, a soldier's *domus* was his city, but where a tribe (e. g. Bessi) was recognized as one of the provincial units (i. e. where the Greek organization by cities had not spread), a soldier was necessarily designated by the tribe as *Bessus*. But *Lycao* was not a unit in the province.

[2] It is of course true that in some cases Roman soldiers are designated, not by their *patria* (city, or other provincial unit as *Bessus*), but by the terms Syrus, Cilix, Cappadox: but (1) these are exceptional cases; Mommsen establishes the rule definitely; (2) Syrus, &c., are to be understood as 'belonging to the province Syria' (used perhaps because the *patria* was not known more accurately). But in the servile designation, *Lycao, Phryx, Cilix, Cappadox*, &c., are the national names, as Mommsen clearly recognizes.

Another way in which the national designations kept a place in Roman usage was in the titles of *cohortes* and *alae* of Paphlagones, Ituraei, and so on. But these were all auxiliary troops, and were therefore styled by extra-Roman names, for they were theoretically soldiers supplied by nations that were in alliance with Rome but not included in the Roman empire: such was their origin, and the names and theory persisted after the nations were incorporated in the empire.

These are the facts in their legal aspect. In practice, of course, the intermediate standing of provincials as not *Romani cives*, as sprung from countries whose names remained necessarily in use, and yet as recognized members of the Roman state, gradually developing by half conscious process towards the Roman citizenship (which they finally attained universally under Caracalla)—that illogical half-developed standing caused inconsistencies and illogicalities in practice. But it is, as we have said, involved in the Roman idea, that the pre-Roman nations were non-Roman and extra-Roman. Slaves, who were non-Roman and extra-Roman, were designated by those national names, but not free citizens (provincials or Romans), nor Roman soldiers in the strict sense. To address the people of a Roman colony like Antiocheia Caesareia or Julia Augusta Gemina Lustra [1] as 'Lycaonians' or 'Phrygians' would have been an insult from a Roman, and a suitable address only from an orator who was attempting to rouse in them national and non-Roman (i. e. anti-Roman) emotions. Nothing could mark more emphatically the *himmelweite* difference between the North-Galatian theory and my point of view on all that concerns Asia Minor, than the words used on this subject by Dr. Zöckler on pp. 95-97. We look at the same thing: he says 'this is black'; I say 'this is white.' On the most fundamental points of the historical questions that were being fought out in the development of Asia Minor

[1] The very spelling *Lustra*, used on coins and inscriptions, is a claim for Latin character: a native city like Prymnessos used the Y even in Latin. Colonia Lustra used Latin in its municipal acts in the first century.

about A. D. 50, we are diametrically in opposition. One or other of us is hopelessly wrong: let the world of scholars decide!

5. Historical Standpoint of the North-Galatian Theory. On the mere point of the difference between geographical and administrative designation our opinions are as different as in other respects. That in geographical points the old names were needed and used by the Romans, I have urged repeatedly: only in administrative and classificatory respects were the Roman terms used or useful. But Dr. Zöckler, p. 95, appeals to *CIL* 312 and 318 in such a way as to suggest that in them Caesennius Gallus 80–82 A. D. is designated as governor of a series of countries on a milestone. That is not the case. Gallus speaks about *vias provinciarum Galatiae, Cappadociae, Ponti, Pisidiae, Paphlagoniae, Lycaoniae, Armeniae Minoris.* If he had merely mentioned the roads 'in the (*united*) provinces Galatia-Cappadocia' (see above, p. 23), he would have given no conception of the extent of his road-making operations, for the roads on the single route from Amasia to Tavium might be rightly called *Vias provinciarum Galatiae Cappadociae.* Here, if anywhere, geographical terms are needed; and we do not begin to realize the vast scale of these engineering works, until we read the sequel, *Ponti, Pisidiae, Paphlagoniae, Lycaoniae, Armeniae Minoris.*

Much can be learned from epigraphic evidence, if we begin by understanding properly the rule, and then scrutinize minutely the apparent exceptions, which will always be found (when carefully studied) to make the rule more precise and luminous. We must, however, cling hard to the single aim of understanding the inscriptions, and not merely turn over the pages of the *Corpus* in search of evidence to demolish an opposition theory. But, apparently, to the North-Galatian theorists an inscription is an inscription and it is nothing more. They do not seem to me to see the inscription in its surroundings and accompaniments as a piece of history, nor to recognize the adaptation of words and names to the

situation; while I seem to them to drive a vain prejudice through all obstacles[1]. It is, however, a little hard that Dr. Zöckler should declare that there is no evidence in my favour. One expects that the North-Galatian critics would have familiarized themselves with Mommsen's dissertations on the subject (*Hermes*, 1884, 1–79, 210–234, and *Ephem. Epigraph.* v. 159–249). It is expected that the controversialists who judge questions of Roman history should be familiar with Mommsen before they criticize and condemn the opinions of others; and give some reason beyond subjective opinion for the condemnation. I may venture to prophecy that some critic will hereafter censure me for having adopted Mommsen's views on the Roman feeling towards national names without due acknowledgement. As is stated in my preface, I have merely applied to early Christian history the principles which I have learned from Mommsen beyond all others.

A serious and unpleasant difficulty faces me from the outset, especially in the case of Dr. Zöckler, whose courteous and graceful tone in controversy deserves the most cordial and grateful acknowledgement on my side. My case rests on the belief that all my adversaries' arguments are founded on misconceptions about an obscure and remote country, and that the case is clear as noon-day when one understands the words of the historians and geographers. It is very distasteful to me to say in regard to sentence after sentence that 'this statement derives its plausibility entirely from a misunderstanding of some authorities, and an omission of others.' Some German critics of my *Historical Geography* keenly resented two features in it, (1) the strictures on errors made in German works, (2) the want of acknowledgement of what had been rightly said by previous German writers. If I corrected some error of a predecessor, that showed my malignity; if I passed his error unnoticed, that showed

[1] *Man sieht, wohin das übermässig zähe Festhalten an einer vorgefassten Meinung führen kann!* says Dr. Zöckler, p. 95.

my disposition to borrow without acknowledgement[1]. If I now make any reply I shall only give further occasion for such criticism. Let me say that in the young German travellers, Buresch, Wilhelm, and many others, I find constant help, a full recognition of the difficulties of the subject, and a survey of the authorities from a proper point of view, which often guides others to results beyond those contemplated by the writer. But these qualities, which are conspicuous in other parts of the work of my North-Galatian opponents, desert them in Asia Minor, because they do not recognize that the subject is difficult and has changed completely in recent years; and they write with the prejudice of early ideas biassing their judgement. I regret to have to say this; but it is fundamental in the case, and, if I discuss the question, I must point it out. I can only assure the North-Galatian theorists that I do not estimate their other work by what seem to me to be the faults of their arguments, when they tread the soil of Asia Minor. In Asia Minor they seem to me, in the attempt to prop up their fundamental mistake about Galatia, to be led on to further and worse mistakes. Such a statement requires examples: I will give a specimen or two at random.

On p. 78 Dr. Zöckler says, that *Josephus* (*Jüd. Alt.* xvi. 6, 2) *für Ancyra das Wohnen von Juden daselbst direct bezeugt.* That is one of the old-fashioned tralaticious blunders, handed on from commentator to commentator on *Acts*, until the dawn of modern scholarship; but I did not expect to find it drawn forth in the year 1894; no weapon, however, is too rusty for the North-Galatian theorist, and this one appears not merely in Dr. Zöckler's article, but in the index to Dr. Schürer's *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (1890), i. p. 690.

[1] If any one thinks this is an unfair account, let him read the forty-six columns of *Berliner Philolog. Wochenschrift*, 1891, that are devoted to the book, by a writer whose sad death this spring is deplored by every one, and by me as much as any. I had never the advantage of seeing Prof. G. Hirschfeld, but we exchanged a few letters in the course of years; and in Feb. 1884, only the length of a journey from Berlin to Königsberg prevented me from going to meet him.

If we take two of the fundamental books that every scholar who ventures to write a page about Asia Minor is expected to know and to use, Mommsen's *Monumentum Ancyranum*, 1883, p. x, and Waddington's *Fastes de la province d'Asie*, p. 102, we find a very different treatment of the passage (perhaps too bold in Waddington).

It is rather absurd to waste time and paper in 1895 in stating the facts; but one may ask the North-Galatians (who almost all[1] quote the passage) how the words ἐν ἐπισημοτάτῳ τόπῳ γενηθέντι μοι (i. e. to Augustus) ὑπὸ τοῦ Κοινοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐν Ἀργύρῃ (where Scaliger alters the text to Ἀγκύρῃ and some more recent critics to Ἀγκύρᾳ) can be understood of Ancyra in Galatia. How could the *Commune Asiae* build a temple to Augustus in the capital of Galatia? If Scaliger's alteration were accepted, we should have to understand that the Phrygian Ancyra was meant; but Chishull, followed by every one who studies Asia Minor, recognized that Scaliger was wrong.

It is not surprising that the North-Galatian theorists, starting from such vague conceptions as to the activity of the *Commune Asiae* in Galatia, reach false conclusions about the direction of Paul's journeys and the names of his hearers. Even Lightfoot, who is usually so accurate, quotes this passage of Josephus: 'in the generation before St. Paul Augustus directed a decree, granting especial privileges to the Jews to be inscribed in his temple at Ancyra, the Galatian metropolis.'

Throughout his whole article Dr. Zöckler makes the impression, not of using his knowledge of Asia Minor to judge a difficult question, but of having decided the question and then gone to look in Asia Minor records for proofs to support his decision. Hence he sees only what seems to agree with his decision. There can I think be no other reason why he makes some of the statements which vex me so often. Let me take just one of his opening principles, which is perhaps

[1] I must except Lipsius, who is correct on this point: see his edition of *Galatians*, p. 1, in the *Handkommentar zum N. T.*

the most fundamental point in his reasoning. He says (p. 56), *Läge dieser lukanische Bericht über ein erstmaliges Gelangen Pauli nach der 'Galatischen Landschaft' für sich allein vor, so hätte ein Zweifel daran, dass Nordgalatien hier in Rede stand, niemals sich bilden* können. *Die Sachlage ist so klar als nur möglich: wie* Φρυγία, Ἀσία, Μυσία, Βιθυνία *Landschaftsnamen und nicht politische Administrativbezeichnungen sind, ganz ebenso muss* Γαλατικὴ χώρα *aufgefasst werden.* If his statement about Φρυγία, Ἀσία, &c., were right, it would be almost conclusive! But he assumes three false premises, which contain his desired result implicit.

(1) The single phrase 'Galatische Landschaft,' so far from being in his favour, seems to me (as stated in my book, p. 80) dead against him. Dr. Zöckler's adversary had founded his strongest argument on that special phrase; and Dr. Zöckler, without meeting or even alluding to the argument, founds his opening argument on the assertion that that phrase is entirely in his own favour. That may be a telling forensic stroke; but, when used by a scholar, it rather takes one aback, and is hard to reply to.

(2) Ἀσία is the name of a Roman province: on what ground does Dr. Zöckler say that it is not an administrative term? Further than this, I say that in every case where 'Asia' is mentioned by Strabo or by Pliny or by Ptolemy or by Tacitus, it means the Roman province or a region more extensive than the Roman province, and not, as Dr. Zöckler assumes, one that is narrower than the province. In my book the possibility is conceded that Asia might be used in *Acts* in the narrow sense; to this concession it must now be added that I have failed to find any example of that narrower use in writers of the period [1]. Ptolemy contrasts τὴν μεγάλην Ἀσίαν the continent with τὴν ἰδίαν Ἀσίαν (also τὴν ἰδίως καλουμένην Ἀσίαν) the province (and he uses Ἀσίαν simply to indicate the province in several places, e.g. v. 4, 1; v. 5, 1). Strabo has

[1] An example is quoted by Strabo, p. 627, from Demetrius of Skepsis, 'τάχα γὰρ ἡ Μῃονία,' φησίν, ''Ασία ἐλέγετο.' That example is not strong.

the same contrast between Asia the continent[1] and Ἀσίαν ἰδίως λεγομένην (p. 577) the province (using Ἀσίαν simply to indicate the province on pp. 624, 628)[2]. The same contrast appears in Pliny[3], and in all the prose writers of the time whom I have consulted. The meanings 'continent' and 'province' are therefore the only ones possible in *Acts*, if we go by the analogy of contemporary writers. The former, of course, cannot be thought of in *Acts*: the latter is purely administrative; it cannot be traced earlier than the Roman province, and it ended the moment that the Roman province was dissolved. It arose in Roman usage, which designated Attalus's kingdom as 'Asia'; and it forced itself into Greek use only very slowly. I am ashamed to take the position of teaching scholars far better than myself such elementary facts as this. Sound scholarship is conspicuous in Dr. Zöckler's work (from which I have learned much); and only the distorting influence of a fundamental error could have led him to some of the statements which he makes about Galatia. But even the best scholarship cannot give sound reasons for a false theory[4].

With regard to the narrow sense of 'Asia' as the Aegean coast, which I allowed in my book to be possible, I find no examples in authors of this period. De Vit in his *Onomasticon* speaks of it thus: *Strab.* 14 *init. specialiter Asiam vocat Ioniam ubi Ephesus sita fuit. Hinc et in Novo Testamento hoc nomine saepe Ionia venit, ut Luc. Act. xvi.* 6, *coll. ii.* 9, *vi.* 9, *xix.* 10, *xx.* 16, *etc.*, 1 *Cor. xvi.* 19, 2 *Cor. i.* 8, 1 *Pet. i.* 1, *Apocal. i.* 4 *et* 11. Among De Vit's examples I find none

[1] Ἀσίαν προσαγορεύσαντες ὁμώνυμον τῇ ἠπείρῳ, calling the province Asia with the same name as the continent, p. 624. In one case, p. 126, he seems to use 'Asia' in the sense of what we would now call Asia Minor.

[2] Ἀσίας in Strabo, p. 618, is doubtful, but without other confirmation it must be taken in the usual sense. Ἀσίην, p. 634, I take in the narrowest sense, but Mimnermus is the writer, not Strabo.

[3] Except in one curious passage, noticed below.

[4] Dr. Zöckler's countryman Forbiger, in his *Alte Geogr.*, speaks quite sensibly about Asia, whereas my countryman, Cramer, writes vaguely and inaccurately. Kiepert, in his *Manual of Ancient Geography*, makes only few references to Asia, but all correct (I assume his index to be complete).

that support him[1]. 'Asia' occurs twice in the first ten pages of Strabo's *Lib.* xiv: in one case we have ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἀσίᾳ Ἄβυδον Ἄρισβαν Παισόν, where it is too ridiculous to make it mean 'Ionia'; in the other τὴν Ἀσίαν τὴν ἐντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου, i.e. 'Asia on this side Taurus,' which is larger than the province Asia. The usage of *Acts* is in dispute. If any one maintains that 'Asia' in 1 Cor. xvi. 19, 1 Pet. i. 1, Apocal. i. 4 and 11 means Ionia, it is vain to argue with him.

Of course the poets are not included in my survey. We speak of the usage of prose authors.

It need hardly be added that in the inscriptions of Ionia, Lydia, Caria, Phrygia, in the early centuries of our era, the term 'Asia' often occurs, and regularly in the sense of the province. But the North-Galatian theorists insist that the language of *Acts* is not like that current in the country; and the odd thing is that they insist upon it as a self-evident and axiomatic fact, that the author of *Acts* must have used his terms in his own unexampled way, and they never dream of supporting their contention by quoting any similar usage (except Pliny v. 28 [102]).

We must consider the hard passage of Pliny, v. 28 (102), which Blass on Acts xvi. 6–8 considers to warrant the conclusion that 'Asia' ordinarily denotes *Mysiam, Ioniam, Lydiam, Cariam, Phrygia tamen exclusa.* They run thus, 'from Telmessos (begins)[2] the Asiatic or Carpathian Sea and Asia in the strict sense. Agrippa divided it (i.e. Asia) into two parts: one of these parts he enclosed on the east by Phrygia, Lycaonia, on the west by the Aegean Sea, on the south by the Egyptian Sea, on the north by Paphlagonia . . . The other he marked off on the east by Armenia Minor, on the west by Phrygia, Lycaonia, Pamphylia, on the north by the Pontic Province, on the south by the Pamphylian Sea.' This is hard to understand on any theory. Blass understands that the first part was ordinarily called 'Asia,' and that it

[1] Dion Cassius, 38, 38, speaks of the country described by De Vit, but can only indicate it by a circumlocution: ἡ Ἀσία ἡ περὶ τὴν Ἰωνίαν.

[2] Pliny, v. 101, *quae Lyciam finit Telmessos.*

contained Mysia, Ionia, Lydia, Caria: he does not explain how this part can be bounded by Paphlagonia, nor how Phrygia can be a boundary of both parts (surely if it bounds the one, it must be in the other). To be brief about a passage that would need a long discussion [1], it may be said that Pliny seems here to give a confused account derived from an authority who distinguished the province Asia (*quae proprie vocatur Asia*) as bounded on the east by Phrygia Galatica, Lycaonia, [Galatia], on the north by Paphlagonia, [Bithynia], from Asia in the sense of Asia Minor; and that Pliny's first part is the provinces Asia and Lycia and Pamphylia and Bithynia taken together and badly defined, and his second part is got by subtracting this from Asia in the sense of Asia Minor. But I see no possibility of taking either part in the sense of Mysia, Ionia, Lydia, Caria, as Dr. Blass assumes.

(3) Bithynia was both a *Landschaftsname* and a *politische Administrativbezeichnung*: and its extent in the former sense is nearly the same as in the latter. Dr. Zöckler assumes as self-evident that *Acts* uses it in the former. I have argued in *Expositor*, July, 1895, that *Acts* uses it in the latter. At any rate I have given reasons: Dr. Zöckler assumes.

(4) Phrygia has two uses in *Acts* and elsewhere. It is sometimes a great country, part in Asia and part in Galatia; at other times it is used, either as a noun, or as an adjective with χώρα, in the sense of *Phrygia Galatica*. Dr. Zöckler surely does not deny the second use as a noun in such inscriptions as *CIL* iii. 312 and 318, which he quotes.

6. The Lycaonian Tetrarchy. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, v. 95, says [2]: 'The Pisidians are bounded by the Lycaonia [i. e. that part of Lycaonia] which looks to the jurisdiction of the

[1] Strabo, p. 126, may be used to illustrate it. He there uses Asia almost exactly in the sense in which we use Asia Minor, and says *καλοῦμεν Ἀσίαν ταύτην ἰδίως καὶ ὁμωνύμως τῇ ὅλῃ.*

[2] *Hos* [i. e. *Pisidas*] *includit Lycaonia in Asiaticam iurisdictionem versa, cum qua conveniunt Philomelienses, Tymbriani, Leucolithi, Pelteni* (?), *Tyrienses* (?) [*vv. ll. Peltheni, Pateni, Tiriesses, Titienses, Hyrienses, Datienses*]. *Datur et tetrarchia ex Lycaonia, qua parte Galatiae contermina est,*

province Asia [i. e. is classed under the Asian jurisdiction], in the same conventus with which are the people of Philomelion and of Tymbrion, the Leucolithi, the Pelteni, the people of Tyriaion: from Lycaonia also, on the side which adjoins Galatia, a tetrarchy is furnished, containing fourteen cities, the most famous being Iconium. Of Lycaonia proper (as distinguished from Asian Lycaonia and the Tetrarchy), the famous cities are Thebasa in Taurus, Hyde on the frontier of Galatia and Cappadocia.'

In this passage it is plain that Pliny distinguishes three separate divisions of Lycaonia, (1) a part assigned to the province Asia, belonging to the conventus of Philomelion [1], (2) the Tetrarchy, containing Iconium and thirteen other cities, conterminous with Galatia proper, (3) Lycaonia strictly so called [2], containing Thebasa and Hyde.

What was this Lycaonian Tetrarchy [3]? We can hardly doubt that it was nearly equivalent to the part of Lycaonia that was assigned to Amyntas, and afterwards made part of the Roman Empire (while Lycaonia *ipsa* was given to Archelaus, and afterwards to Antiochus) [4]. But why should

civitatium XIV, urbe celeberrima Iconio. Ipsius Lycaoniae celebrantur Thebasa in Tauro, Hyde in confinio Galatiae atque Cappadociae. A latere autem eius super Pamphyliam veniunt Thracum suboles Milyae quorum Arycanda oppidum. In the last sentence *eius* must refer back to *Pisidia*, which is understood from *Pisidae* in 94. The account of Lycaonia is taken as parenthetical, being merely a statement of the boundary of Pisidia. It is impossible to understand that Pliny was so far wrong in his topography as to put the Milyae on the border of Lycaonia.

[1] Apparently he is here led into some error by the fact that a people called Lycaones were settled in the eastern parts of central Phrygia. In an inscription this people is distinguished as Λυκάονες πρὸς ἔνδον. If any part of the country usually called Lycaonia was included in the province Asia, it must have been Tyriaion, which Pliny mentions in addition to Asian Lycaonia (if the text of Sillig be correct; but for my own part I am inclined to read *Tityassenses*).

[2] I take the exact force of *Lycaonia ipsa* to be the country which actually bears the name Lycaonia, as distinguished from the part called Galatic and the part called Asiatic.

[3] In the following investigation it is distinguished as 'the Tetrarchy,' from the ordinary Galatian tetrarchies.

[4] To Archelaos 20 B.C.; to Antiochus 37 A.D. See § 7.

this part of Lycaonia be called 'the Tetrarchy'? There are only two possible explanations of this name (so far as I can judge). The first would be that the Romans gave this title to the part of Lycaonia which was included in the province. Now, as is perfectly well-known, the idea of Tetrarchies was a peculiarly Galatian institution; and if the Romans gave to part of their province the name Tetrarchy, they must have applied the peculiar Galatian organization to that part of the province, and made it Galatian in the strictest sense. That would suit the South-Galatian theory excellently; but I cannot think it is probable.

There is no reason to think that the Roman province was organized according to tetrarchies; rather the scanty evidence leads us to think that the tetrarchies were disused when the province was instituted, and that the use of the term indicates a pre-Roman institution. We must, I think, prefer the second explanation—that the Lycaonian Tetrarchy originated in the pre-Roman period, i.e. the Lycaonian Tetrarchy conterminous with Galatia proper was one of the twelve Galatian tetrarchies, four of which composed the territory of each of the three tribes.

Now it is clear that this Lycaonian Tetrarchy was not part of the original Galatian territory, for in that case it would have been merged in North Galatia, whereas clearly it was distinguished from Galatia; and moreover, Pliny implies that a Tetrarchy was given or added (*datur*) out of Lycaonia to an already existing Galatia. The Tetrarchy must therefore have been a later conquest, made after the term Galatia had become fixed in a precise geographical sense.

Other reasons also point to the conclusion that the Lycaonian Tetrarchy was conquered by the Galatians at a comparatively late period. It is clear that the conquest had not taken place in 190 B.C., for Lycaonia is mentioned as one of the countries which had belonged to Antiochus, and were transferred to Eumenes[1]; and it would be absurd to assign

[1] In the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (1895), pp. 285, 351, I have

Lycaonia to Eumenes, if the Tetrarchy belonged to the Galatians. Moreover, it is clear that the road across Lycaonia was in the hands of the Seleucid kings of Syria, whose armies marched back and forward over it: in fact, the Seleucid empire in Asia Minor was impossible, unless that road was under their power and in their territory. Their kingdom would have been severed into two practically unconnected parts, if the Tetrarchy had been conquered by the Galatians.

Further, the very names of the cities along the Great Eastern Highway, Apameia, Lysias, Laodiceia Katakekaumene, show that the route was guarded by foundations of the Seleucid kings.

The conclusion is, therefore, certain: the Lycaonian Tetrarchy had not been conquered by the Galatians in 190 B.C.

The history of central Asia Minor in the century that followed the peace and the redistribution of power in 190 B.C. is most obscure. Lycaonia was assigned to Eumenes, according to Livy and Polybius; but there is not the slightest evidence that the Pergamenian kings ever ruled it. A vast territory had been suddenly assigned to them, and it is obvious that they must have found some difficulty in establishing their power over it [1]. Lycaonia was in no way useful for the maintenance of their empire, as it had been for the Seleucid kings; and it was not a specially desirable or defensible country in itself, consisting chiefly of open, flat plains. Moreover, it is certain that Eumenes was involved in frequent wars with the Galatae, and that he was not loyally supported by the Romans, who were rather jealous of his growing strength and success. In fact, the Romans on the whole rather prevented him from vigorously prosecuting the war

hesitated about the reading and the history of this episode, and have left the question open; but the following investigation shows that the reading *Lycaonia* must be right in Livy xxxvii. 54, 11, and Polyb. xxii. 5, 14; though there is still a possibility (but no more) that it is wrong in Livy xxxviii. 39, 16, and Polyb. xxii. 27, 10.

[1] See *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, p. 259.

against the Galatae. His earlier wars indeed from 190 to 170 were more successful; he conquered the Galatae, and obtained some regular and acknowledged rights over them[1]; the altar of Zeus the Saviour, with its magnificent sculptures (now at Berlin), was built to commemorate his victories; and Galatian horsemen served in his armies[2]. But this fair prospect was clouded over, owing to Roman jealousy. The selfish policy of the Republic did not desire a powerful king in Asia; its aim was to let the states of Asia wear themselves out in mutual warfare. Hence it began to favour the Galatae; and when in 167 they had penetrated into the Pergamenian kingdom as far as Synnada, a Roman envoy pretended to order them to retire, and reported that they despised his orders. The difficulties in which Eumenes was involved became more serious, and in the years that preceded his death he was involved in frequent wars with the Galatae. It is highly probable that some of the tales of depredations committed by the Gauls in Asia must be referred to this period.

We have then to answer the question, what was the fate of Lycaonia during this period? Although there is no direct evidence, we can hardly doubt that it was plundered and overrun by the Galatae; and the fact seems certain that Lycaonia, which was assigned to Eumenes in 190, was not in the territory bequeathed by Attalus III to the Romans in 133. We must, I think, conclude that the western and north-western part of Lycaonia passed into the hands of the Galatae soon after 167, and was made one of the Tetrarchies.

In the next place, can we determine to which of the three tribes, Tolistobogii, Tectosages, or Trocmi, the new Lycaonian Tetrarchy belonged? It is obvious that, if all the tribes together, or one of the complete tribes, had seized this part

[1] Livy xlv. 20 speaks of the war in 167 B.C. as *Gallorum defectionem*.

[2] Livy xliv. 13 *equites Gallos, quos secum adduxerat*. See Van Gelder, *Galatarum res in Graecia et Asia*, p. 260 f., to whom I am much indebted in this investigation. He has collected all the authorities, and used them excellently.

of Lycaonia, we should not expect that the territory would be constituted a distinct new tetrarchy, but rather that it should be incorporated as additional land in the existing tetrarchies, whose number was fixed. There is apparently only one way in which the new territory could have become one of the tetrarchies, viz. if one of the tribes had lost part of its land and the new territory replaced the lost land. Now, when the Galatae were pressing so hard on the Pergamenian kingdom to the west, it is unlikely that the western tribe, Tolistobogii, or the central tribe, Tektosages, would lose part of their land. But the tribe on the east, Trocmi, were hard pressed by their neighbours, both of Pontus and of Cappadocia. They are more likely to have required new land for a tetrarchy, in compensation for losses on the east. Let us scrutinize the few recorded facts.

Pharnaces, king of Pontus before 183 and at least as late as 169, pressed very hard on the countries west of him[1]. As Van Gelder says, 'it seems probable that Pharnaces had held Galatia either as subject or as allied since 185'; and in 183 an envoy was sent from Rome to make an arrangement between Eumenes and Pharnaces. But, in spite of this and other Roman embassies and the agreements they patched up, war continued for some years to rage between Pharnaces on the one side, and Eumenes and Ariarathes king of Cappadocia on the other. In this war part at least of the Galatae were on the side of Pharnaces. But Eumenes and Ariarathes gained the advantage in 181, and would have certainly punished Pharnaces, had not the Romans interfered and declared that they would themselves arrange peace—one of the first overt symptoms of their growing jealousy of Eumenes. Their orders and negotiations produced no result; and in 180 and 179 the allied kings Eumenes and Ariarathes seem to have had their own way unimpeded, and a peace was concluded in 179, one of the conditions of which was that

[1] The ensuing paragraph is practically an abstract of what Van Gelder says, *Galatarum res in Graecia et Asia* (Amsterdam, 1888), p. 257 f.

Pharnaces should evacuate Galatia, and that all arrangements which he had made with them should be void.

Whether or not Pharnaces succeeded either at this moment or later in retaining some part of the Galatian territory (which could only be in the Trocmian country), certain it is that a few years later, in 164 as we learn from Polybius, the Trocmi were making constant but unsuccessful efforts to wrest some territory from Ariarathes. These efforts imply that their country had become too narrow for them; and the hypothesis which seems to suit all the facts is that part of their country had been seized either by Pharnaces, or by Ariarathes, or both; and that after vainly trying to extend themselves to the south into Cappadocia, they directed their efforts to the southwest and occupied part of Lycaonia.

According to Van Gelder, p. 274, the dispute between Ariarathes and the Trocmi as to the territory on the frontier was decided in 160 in favour of the Cappadocian king; and our hypothesis leads us to the conclusion that the Lycaonian territory, already overrun frequently by the Galatae in their long wars against Eumenes, and prostrate before them, was then made a part of the Galatian state, and the Lycaonian Tetrarchy was constituted as the fourth Trocmian Tetrarchy.

This inference, which possesses plausibility and a certain degree of probability, is raised to a very much higher level in historical reasoning by the evidence of an inscription, which hitherto has not been correctly understood. It belongs to Apollonia, a city in that part of Phrygia which was incorporated in the province Galatia, and which previously had been in the kingdom of Amyntas; and it is dated in the year 247 of an era whose beginning is uncertain [1]. A certain Sagaris placed this inscription on an altar, which he dedicated to the king of the gods as a thanksgiving, because Zeus had saved his oxen during a famine and preserved the lives of men (i.e. the owners), and brought him

[1] Perhaps 190; see below. The inscription is published by M. Waddington as no. 1192 in Le Bas's *Voyage Archéologique*, &c. vol. iii.

safe to his fatherland, the country of the Galatae, and given his son honour among the Trocmi.

7 καὶ βόας ἐρρύσω, ψυχὰς δὲ βροτῶν ἐσά[ωσας,
καὶ Γαλατῶν γαίης ἤγαγες ἐς πατρίδα,
υἷα τ' ἐμὸν κύδηνας ἐνὶ Τρόκμοις ζαθέοι[σι·
10 τοὔνεκεν οὐ μέγα δῶρον ἐγὼ τὸν βωμὸν ἔθ[ηκα.

It seems not open to doubt that the πατρίς which is here meant is the country where Sagaris erected the altar. It is irrational to suppose that he erected in a distant foreign land an offering of gratitude to the god who brought him to his own fatherland. The altar is therefore a clear proof that this city of the province Galatia might be styled by a citizen 'his home among the Galatae [1],' i.e. 'his home in the province of Galatia': to it Zeus brought him back in safety when he travelled, and in it he made his thank-offering, and there his son gained a good position among the Trocmi.

Apollonia then ranked as a city of the Galatae Trocmi at the time when this inscription was composed. There is no way in which it could be classed to the Trocmi, except through its contiguity to the Lycaonian Tetrarchy: we must suppose that the part of Phrygia round Apollonia was added to the Tetrarchy, and thus became part of the territory of the Trocmi; and a citizen of Apollonia who attained distinction might be said to gain glory among the Trocmi.

It would be of some importance to determine the date of this inscription. Unfortunately this is uncertain. The year 247 is given on the stone; but the era is uncertain. Waddington suggests doubtfully the Phrygian era 85–4 B.C.; but it seems improbable that a city of the province Galatia could have reckoned from the era of Sulla's reorganization of Asia. Moreover this inscription seems to me (so far as one can judge from a printed epigraphic copy) to be hardly so late as A.D. 162–3, which Waddington's conjecture would make it. The possibility may be suggested that

[1] One's native city is one's πατρίς according to the regular usage.

Apollonia dated from the era of freedom 190 B.C., when it was released from the yoke of the Seleucid kings. It was then assigned to Eumenes; but there is much doubt whether it ever became really subject to Pergamos [1]. The same era 190 was used at Ariassos for the same reason [2]. Our inscription would then date A.D. 57; and the famine referred to would be the dearth 'throughout all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius' (Acts xi. 28). That famine raged in Jerusalem in 46, in Rome in 51; but the inscription seems to imply that the dedicator made a journey after (or on account of) the famine, and erected the thank-offering after his safe return to his own land. This is, of course, all uncertain: further evidence is needed. The only other dated inscription of the Apollonian valley, Sterrett, *Wolfe Exped.* no. 539, affords no evidence: it suits either era, 85 or 190 [3]. Further, subsequent history forces us to the conclusion that, if Lycaonia did become a Tetrarchy, the change is not likely to have occurred much later than 160. It seems clear that, at some period during the following thirty years, Galatia was conquered by the kings of Pontus. In 129 the Roman proconsul, Manius Aquillius, sold Phrygia Magna to Mithridates V, king of Pontus; and, as Van Gelder, p. 277, points out [4], it would be absurd for the Pontic king to covet Phrygia, if the vast independent country of Galatia lay between his own dominions and Phrygia. The fact that Mithridates ruled Phrygia until his death in 120

[1] G. Hirschfeld made Apollonia a Pergamenian foundation: but he does not take into account that, if Apollonia had been a Pergamenian city, it would have been included in the province Asia. The coins (of the Imperial period) honour Alexander as Founder; and Hirschfeld gives no good reason for discrediting their authority as to its Macedonian (i.e. Seleucid) origin.

[2] See my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, p. 352.

[3] It must be acknowledged that in an inscription of Conana, twelve miles south of Apollonia (Sterrett, 472), the era 190 is impossible on account of the *praenomen* Aur., which occurs twice; the era there used is quite uncertain.

[4] But the words used by Van Gelder, p. 277, are rather loose and inaccurate, 'Galatae, cum exigua iis esset terra.' The writer of these words seems not to have kept his eye on the map, or only to have looked at a small map.

implies that he also ruled Galatia. There is every probability that the Galatae, though sometimes independent, were usually subject to Pontus from this time onwards until the final defeat of Mithridates VI and the reorganization of central and eastern Asia Minor and Syria by Pompey in 65. They could not at this time conquer Lycaonia: it is more probable that the Tetrarchy now became subject to Pontus. Thus a connexion was established between Pontus and the Tetrarchy, which seems to have persisted for nearly a century, so far as we can judge from the scanty records. In 74 B.C. Eumachus, the general of Mithridates VI, conquered the Pisidians and Isaurians, and the country of Cilicia. This seems a senseless account, unless we understand that Lycaonia was already under the Pontic power, for the campaigns against the other countries would have to be made from Lycaonia as basis of operations.

7. My hope was in this article to bring down the history of the province Galatia to the middle of the first century after Christ; but already the allotted limits are more than exhausted. The chief points that remain are these: (1) The activity and direction of Roman policy on the south-eastern frontier of Galatia: this needs a long discussion, as it involves several obscure and doubtful points. (2) The boundary of Galatia on the south-east: it may be said briefly that both Derbe and Laranda were incorporated in the province in A.D. 25; that probably, but not certainly, both Derbe and Laranda were included in the Realm of Antiochus, formed in A.D. 37 but very soon dissolved[1]; and that Derbe was retained in the province, and Laranda assigned to Antiochus, when his Realm was restored to him by Claudius in A.D. 41. (3) The organization and subdivisions of Southern Galatia: there were probably certain *Regiones*, called in Greek χῶραι,

[1] There is no evidence what were the bounds of Caligula's gift to Antiochus, unless Ptolemy's description be interpreted ab ut it (as is done in my *Histor. Geogr.* p. 373): Ptolemy's description is not true of Claudius's gift, but the *Regnum Antiochi*, as restored by Claudius, was probably smaller than Caligula's gift.

viz. (*a*) Pisidia, (*b*) Isauria (Ἰσαυρικὴ [χώρα] in Strabo, p. 569), (*c*) Phrygia Galatica (as distinguished from Phrygia Asiana, called Φρυγία χώρα in Acts xviii. 23, and Φρυγία καὶ Γαλατικὴ χώρα in Acts xvi. 6, (*d*) Lycaonia Galatica (as distinguished from Lycaonia Antiochiana, called ἡ Γαλατικὴ χώρα [τῆς Λυκαονίας] in Acts xviii. 23). The fourth *Regio* included two cities, Claudio-Derbe and Colonia Lystra, with a stretch of cityless territory organized on the Anatolian village-system [1]. The term *Regio* was used as a Roman governmental term to indicate certain subdivisions of the vast province Galatia; for an Antiochian inscription [2] mentions a ἑκατοντάρχην ῥεγεωνάριον, i. e. a centurion who had certain duties extending over a *Regio* of which Antioch was the centre: according to our interpretation this *Regio* is the χώρα mentioned in Acts xiii. 49 and xvi. 6.

But though I cannot print the second half of my paper here, I trust that enough has been already said to prove that only through the general ignorance which prevails about that obscure and remote province could it have appeared inconceivable to any one [3] that the inhabitants of Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra should be summed up as 'Galatae.' Probably that line of defence will not be maintained; but the question will in future take the form, which interpretation, out of two that are conceivable and possible, suits best the words of Acts and of Paul?

On that question four brief remarks may here be made. (1) Dr. Zöckler, p. 89, represents me as saying that the old names Pisidia, Lycaonia, &c., passed out of use, and that Paul and Luke *must* use the Roman names only. I never made nor implied either of these statements: and it is only because Dr. Zöckler has not yet made his mind quite clear as to the facts about Asia Minor that he could have attributed such

[1] On the nature of that system I may refer to *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. pp. 10, 103 f., 124 f., &c.

[2] The inscription is published by Sterrett, *Epigr. Journey*, No. 92. He wrongly alters his copy to read [λ]εγεωνάριον.

[3] For example to Dr. Schürer as quoted on p. 26 above.

meaning to my words. As a matter of fact Luke has never used Γαλατία in the sense of the province Galatia: he has never used the word at all, but has *avoided* it. The adjective Γαλατικός alone is used by him, and its sense is made clear by the inscription *CIG* 3991 and by Ptol. v. 6, 3 and 9. I might devote much space to this adjective; but I think that, if Dr. Zöckler will study the use of the adjective Λακωνικός as a problem in historical and political geography, he will find some instructive results about Γαλατικός.

(2) Dr. Zöckler, p. 55, lays a good deal of stress on the fact that in Luke's account of the first missionary journey, there is no mention of 'Galatia.' I accept the implied challenge, and have already in print the proof that, from the first journey alone, the South-Galatian theory can be established: see my forthcoming *St. Paul: the traveller and the citizen*, ch. v, vi.

(3) With many better scholars, I maintain that, in τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, Φρυγίαν must be an adjective. The North-Galatians say that it must be a noun; if so, let them give examples where a noun with its adjective is connected anarthrously by καί to a preceding noun and article. We of the South-Galatian persuasion think that καί here connects two adjectives, as e.g. Strabo calls one of the Nile-mouths τὸ δὲ Κανωβικὸν καὶ Ἡρακλεωτικόν (p. 788), while, if two separate mouths are meant the order is τὸ Μενδήσιον στόμα καὶ (τὸ) Τανιτικόν (where τό is not essential, compare Acts xviii. 23).

(4) The character of Roman policy in Galatia was such that Christianity at first was necessarily on the same side with it in the great questions that were agitating society; and the development of Church organization from the first onwards took place necessarily, perhaps unintentionally, and certainly inevitably, according to the existing facts of communication and political administration: see the two chapters just quoted from my *St. Paul.*

III.

ACTA PILATI.

[F. C. Conybeare.]

In his *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Lipsiae, 1876), Tischendorf separated two recensions of the Acta Pilati, which he called A and B. These rival texts tell the same story in much the same way, but B seems to be a later recension or overworking of A. Without making a detailed comparison of the two, it is enough in defence of this view to point to the following peculiarities of B.

1. Its language is throughout more rhetorical and less simple and archaic than that of A. Professor Rendel Harris has pointed out that long passages of B, e. g. ch. x and xi, are imitated from the Iliad. Nor was Homer alone the writer's model, for the wailings of the Virgin over her Son recall the strains of an Euripidean chorus.

2. The same thing is apparent in its handling of citations of the N. T. E.g. in ch. x. 1, where the A text has πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν, the B text reads: πάτερ, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην, κ.τ.λ.

3. B strives to harmonize itself with canonical or later texts. Of this we select two salient examples. According to the A form, the Ascension took place in Galilee from a mountain of which the name is spelt μαμίλχ, Mambre, Malrech, &c., in the various sources. In B ch. xiv. 1, the event still occurs in Galilee, but from the *Mount of Olives*[1]. The same

[1] Alfred Resch (*Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*, Leipzig, 1894, p. 381 ff.) suggests that in the Acta Pilati, as also in Mat. xxviii. 16, Γαλιλαία is not the

harmonizing tendency is already seen in some Greek MSS. of the A form, and also in the old Latin version of A; for it reads, ch. xiv. 1, 'in Monte Oliveti, qui vocatur Mambre sive Malech.' Similarly from the A form there is absent the teaching of the virginity of the mother of Christ. Twelve leading Jews appear before Pilate, and meet the hostile allegation that Jesus was born of fornication by swearing that he was the legitimate son of Joseph and Mary. The B text however has it thus, cap. ii. 3, *οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Μαρίαν ὁ Ἰωσὴφ κατὰ λόγον μνηστείας ἐδέξατο εἰς τήρησιν.* So in B x and elsewhere Mary is called *ἡ θεοτόκος.*

4. Comparatively late theological ideas figure in B. E. g. ch. xv. we read as follows: *οὐδὲν ἄπιστον εἰ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη· προτύπωσις γὰρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὁ προφήτης Ἠλίας ἦν.* Here the word *προτύπωσις* indicates a reflective stage of Christian belief of which there are no signs in A.

5. The Coptic version given in a papyrus of the fifth century, the Latin version of parts of which there is a palimpsest text at Vienna as early as the fifth or sixth century, and lastly the Armenian version, which was probably made in

region of North Palestine referred to everywhere else in the Gospels, but a tract close to Jerusalem, mentioned in the P. E. as *περίχωρος*, of which word indeed he believes the name Galilee to be here the Aramaic original. He further suggests that the Mount of Olives is in the A. P. called Mamilch, because of its association in Israelitish history with the worship of Moloch. But Matt. xxvi. 32 and 69, not to adduce many other passages, seem to me conclusive against Resch's ingenious hypothesis. As regards the A. P. the words *in Monte Oliveti* are clearly but a late gloss, for they do not appear in good MSS. of the earlier or A form of the text, and the Coptic and Armenian versions also lack them. The gloss however, if it be one, is in two MSS. of the Latin A. P. of the thirteenth century. Perhaps the Itineraries appealed to by Resch (*Aussercan. Parallelt.* p. 386) have themselves been influenced by so widely diffused a writing as the A. P. e. g. Resch cites Antonius de Cremona: 'Prope montem Oliveti est mons collateralis, qui olim dictus est mons offensionis, eo scilicet quod rex Salomon quondam posuit ibi ydolum Moloch adorans illud. In eodem monte offensionis est locus, qui vocatur Galilaea, ubi apparuit Christus discipulis suis.' May not the place in question have acquired among pilgrims the name of Galilee owing to the reflex influence of the A. P.?

the sixth century, all give the A text. This is good evidence that that is by far the older of the two.

6. Another sign of the inferior age of the B text is that it omits the Aramaic originals preserved in A of the words *σῶσον δή, ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι* Κυρίου (ch. i. 4); also of the words (ch. xi. 1) *εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθημι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.*

The Armenian version follows the A text, and I have used three MSS. of it which I call *α*, *β*, *γ*.

α = Ancien Fonds Arménien in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, No. 44. This is a large paper codex, 520 × 332 mill., and very heavy. It contains 501 folios. The writing of this codex, as appears from notices it contains, was completed A.D. 1194, or 643 of the Armenian era. The writing is uncial, in double columns. The A. P. occupy f. 402–f. 410 verso. This text I myself transcribed.

β = No. 88 of the same collection, a codex similar to *α*, but written on parchment in uncials of a more archaic form than those of *α*. It is not dated, but is certainly an older codex than *α*. It contains 643 folios, and is 510 × 326 mill., two columns to the page. The A. P. begin on f. 125. I owe my copy of this text to the kindness of the Rev. Father Carékin of the Mechitarist Congregation of Venice.

γ is a more recent codex in the library of San Lazzaro, Venice, but well and correctly written. It gives the same text as *β*. I owe my collation of it with *β* to Father Carékin.

In the following pages I give a literal retranslation into Greek of *α*, and a literal Latin translation of *β*. There is so much difference between the two texts that it was too laborious to print one only and give the variants of the other below the text. To facilitate comparison of the two, I have bracketed in the Latin version of *β* all words or sentences that do not occur in *α*, and in *α* all passages which are simply absent from *β*.

I have also printed in italics those passages of *β* where

a has another text. Insignificant variations in the order of the same words I have not thus marked, but, as I follow the order of the Armenian words in each translation, the reader can for himself detect these minor variations.

These two Armenian texts are two recensions of one and the same version, and their fundamental identity is clear to any one who will glance over my Latin version and mark how much of it is the same in *a*. At the same time their differences are not explicable as an inside growth of an Armenian text, but must be the result of a fresh comparison with Greek texts of the original Armenian version. This is proved by the many cases in which the peculiar readings both of *a* and *β* are reproduced in the Greek, Latin, or Coptic sources. Here is an example:—

Text of *a*. Cap. xv. 5.

Καὶ ὑπήντησεν αὐτοῖς Νικόδημος καὶ λέγει (*or?* εἶπεν)· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ. καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κῆπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤκουσεν ἅπαν τὸ συνέδριον, καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἐκάθισε μέσον Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα. ἀνοίξας δὲ Νικόδημος.

Text of *β*. Cap. xv. 5.

Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, παρασκευὴ ἦν· ὀρθρίσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευῖται εἰς τὸν οἶκον Νικοδήμου εἶπαν. εἰρήνη σοι καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ. καὶ ἠσπάσαντο ἀλλήλους. καὶ λαβὼν αὐτοὺς Νικόδημος εἰσήνεγκεν εἰς τὸν κῆπον αὐτοῦ· ἐκάθισαν ἅπαντες καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμησεν ζητεῖν ῥῆμά τι. ἔπειτα εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Ἰωσήφ· τί ἐστιν ὅτι ἐκεκλήκατέ με; αὐτοὶ δὲ διανεύουσι τῷ Νικοδήμῳ ὥστε λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰωσήφ. καὶ εἶπε (*or?* ἔπειτα λέγει) Νικόδημος.

We find the peculiarities of each of these texts in other sources. To begin with those of *a*: The words τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον —Νικοδήμου are not in Tischendorf's Greek codex C, which

therefore agreed here with *a*. Καί is added before ὑπήντησεν by A C (see Tischendorf's App. Crit. p. 270). The words καὶ εἶπεν εἰρ. ὑμῖν are omitted by C, but given in A B E Vatt. Then the reading καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ. καὶ εἰσήν. is found in A alone, of which the text here provokes this remark of Tischendorf: 'A in his haud dubie vitiosus est; omittit enim καὶ εἶπαν una cum εἰρήνη σοι, ita ut καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ cum εἰρήνη ὑμῖν coniungat; rursus καὶ παντὶ usque Ἰωσήφ omittit.' I question however whether A has not here the right text. Then εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτούς is in A B E, but not in C which has ὡς ἤνεγκαν αὐτούς. Then εἰς τὸν κῆπον αὐτοῦ is in C, but not in A B E, which with the Latin texts read οἶκον for κῆπον. The reading ἤκουσεν may be due to a corruption in the Armenian text. ἅπαν τὸ συνέδριον is read in all the Greek sources except C which seems here defective; so are the next words καὶ Ἰωσήφ—Καϊάφα. For the omission which follows of the words καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμ.—πρὸς τὸν Ἰωσήφ I can find a single and but partial parallel in the sources which Tischendorf arrays, namely in codex C of the Latin version which omits καὶ εἶπεν Ἰωσήφ· τί ὅτι ἐκεκλήκατέ με; Turning now to *β*, we find the words τῇ δὲ ἐπ.—Νικοδήμου in all sources except Greek C, in much the same form as in *β*, except that for οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευ. is read οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευ.: B however reads with *β*: οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευ. After Νικοδήμου Tischendorf reads ὑπήντησεν αὐτοῖς Νικόδημος καὶ εἶπεν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν καί, words which *β* omits. The Greek codex C omits καὶ εἶπεν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, but continues καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευῖται. The Latin C has as follows: 'et occurrerunt eis Nicodemus et Ioseph et postquam salutaverant se ad invicem, consederunt, sedente Ioseph in medio Annae et Caiaphae.' Proceeding with the text *β* we find the words εἶπαν. εἰρήνη σοι καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ in most of the sources. Then *β* agrees with *a* in rejecting the words καὶ παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ σου καὶ παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰωσήφ. They are partially absent from the Greek C, and wholly from the Latin C. The next words,

καὶ ἠσπάσαντο ἀλλήλους, occur in the Latin C alone. The next words, καὶ λ. αὐ. Νικόδημος εἰσ., are reflected in the Greek sources B Vatt. and in all MSS. of the Latin versions except Latin C. Most Greek MSS. omit Νικόδημος.

We noticed that εἰς τὸν κῆπον αὐτοῦ agrees with α and with Greek C. The words which follow ἐκάθισαν ἅπαντες καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν agree with Latin C alone: 'consederunt, sedente Ioseph in medio Annae et Caiaphae;' other texts have καὶ ἐκαθέσθη ἅπαν τὸ συνέδριον, καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἐκάθισε μέσον Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα or similar. ζητεῖν in the next sentence is reflected in the '*interrogare* Iosephum verbum' found in Latin C and in no other MS. ῥῆμά τι occurs, only transposed, in Greek C. In the next clause πρὸς αὐτούς is found also in Greek C and Vatt. and in the Latin version. τί ἐστιν ὅτι comes in Greek C. αὐτοὶ δὲ διανεύουσι is reflected in the Latin version: 'illi vero innuerunt.' The phrase 'ut loqueretur cum,' which exactly fits the Armenian, but which I render by ὥστε λαλῆσαι πρός, only occurs in the Latin version. Lastly, β omits the phrase ἀνοίξας . . . τὸ στόμα, for which Latin B substitutes the word 'surgens.'

Such an analysis might be extended throughout the two texts α and β with the same results, and it shows that, where α and β differ from each other, they do so, because the original Armenian version was compared afresh with a Greek manuscript and in either one or both of α and β we have the results of such a recension.

From what language was the Armenian version originally made? From what MSS., Greek or Latin, was the recension made? At what date was the version made? Which of the two texts α or β is the older? Of what value for the history of the text is the Armenian version? Here are questions which may be taken in order.

The original Armenian version was probably made from Greek. If not, it is difficult to account for the rendering in ch. xii. 1 'in communi monumento,' ἐν κοινῷ μνημείῳ, found

both in *a* and *β*. It is of course conceivable that κοινῷ was in the Greek text, and is not the translator's misreading of καινῷ. The Greek MS. B actually has κενῷ in this passage. I have noticed but a single marked Syriacism in the Armenian text (in ix. 1). Moreover the text reads throughout like a translation of the Greek. The later recension was also made from Greek copies. For in ch. xv. 1, the Greek ἐν παντὶ ὁρίῳ is translated in *β* as = 'in omnes fines,' but in *a* as = 'in omnibus montibus' (ὄρίῳ). Whichever of the two renderings be the result of a recension, it must have been a Greek manuscript from which the recension was made. In ch. ix. 2 in *a* we have καταγελᾶτε, a misreading of καταλέγετε, where *β* has λέγετε.

The date at which the version was made cannot be determined. The A. P. was the most popular of all apocryphs; it is therefore likely to have been one of the earliest books translated into Armenian. The style of the version is certainly identical with that of the Armenian Gospels; but the text of the latter seems to have been fairly well fixed when the A. P. were translated, for the scrappy citations of the Gospels and N. T. in general which they contain are on the whole rendered in the same terms as in the Armenian Vulgate. In the Greek retranslation of *a* I have given in heavy type all such citations of the *Armenian* N. T. Such an amount of agreement is only conceivable, if the A. P. were translated by one familiar with the Armenian Vulgate. This latter was completed soon after 400 A. D.; so we have here a 'terminus a quo.' The A. P. were probably translated before 700 A. D., and most likely before 600 A.D. For neither *a* nor *β* nor *γ* give the prologue of Ananias Protector, which was prefixed to the Acts in the reign of Flavius Theodosius, and which is already included in the Coptic version and in the Vienna Palimpsest. This consideration, however, really proves no more than that the Armenian translator used an old text which lacked this addition. On grounds of style, however, I would not date the

version later than A. D. 650. We must not assume that either *a* or *β* gives without contamination the original Armenian version, or that one embodies more of that version than the other. If the view to which one naturally leans, that the shorter and terser text is the earlier, be just; then *a* is the older text. Thus in ch. ii. 4, we find omitted or at least absent in *a* the words 'ad Iudaeos qui dixerunt eum esse ex fornicatione natum.' So in ii. 5, the words 'quoniam non est natus ex fornicatione,' and just below, 'viris qui dicebant quoniam non est natus ex fornicatione.' These words are not essential to the sense, and putting aside the omissions in *a* attributable to homoioteleuton, we find that in most cases where it is shorter than *β*, it is so by the absence of matter quite unessential to the narrative. It may, of course, be said that a scribe anxious to shorten his task might have made such omissions; but what is to be said of other omissions in *a* like the following? In ii. 4, *a* omits 'et maleficus est' (*καὶ γόης ἐστίν*), and again in ii. 6. No scribe would have omitted these words twice over in order to simply shorten his labour by removing a superfluity. Still less would he remove for such a reason the words in ii. 4 *ὅτι ὅρμαστρα γέγοναν*, or in ii. 4 the words *καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὰ ὅρμαστρα Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας παραγεγόναμεν*[1]. It is only in *a* that these omissions occur, and we can only explain them by supposing that they occurred in the Greek text originally rendered into Armenian, or were made at a later time for dogmatic reasons. The latter alternative need hardly be discussed. Any such reason as could have led to their rejection from the Armenian, would have excluded them from several Greek copies; but they occur in all. Nor are they words which, being already in the version, an Armenian reviser would have excluded, because he found them absent from his later Greek copy. To put it briefly, a reviser would probably supplement the text of his version

[1] Cp. also omission of the words 'Gibberosus eram,' &c., in vi. 2, where *γ* confirms *a*. Compare also the parallel omissions of *a* in xiii. 3 and xiv. 3.

from Greek copies consulted afresh, but he would be little likely to curtail it. It is therefore probable that *a* is the older form of the Armenian text. Beyond probabilities, however, we cannot go, the more so as *β* occasionally omits important matter found in *a*. E.g. in ii. 1 Pilate repeats in *a* the substance of his wife's dream: πολλὰ γὰρ ἔπαθον ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί, but adds καὶ ἔγνων ὅτι οὗτός ἐστι κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν. Now it would be possible to explain the absence from *β* of the words πολλά to νυκτί as the rejection of a superfluity, for they have been given just above in the message of Pilate's wife. But the sentence καὶ ἔγνων, κ.τ.λ., has not been so given, and it is therefore no superfluity.

We saw above that the omissions in *a* are, as a rule, omissions of matter retained in all other sources. In the same way this addition, καὶ ἔγνων, κ.τ.λ., is of words given in no other source. It is possible that it formed part of the original Armenian version, and was excluded from *β* as being an addition to the canonical text of Matt. xxvii. 19. In xiv. 1 there is another notable omission from *β* of matter found in *a*. The latter text gives, in common with the Greek and Latin sources, verses 15–18 of Mark xvi., as teaching delivered by Christ to His disciples on Mount Mambrech, just before His ascension. Now *β* omits verses 17 and 18, and gives verses 15 and 16 very imperfectly, and in such a way as to suggest that he has Matt. xxviii. 19 and John iii. 18 in his mind[1]. The reason of the omission in *β* is probably this, that the Armenian church after the fifth century rejected Mark xvi. 9–20 as spurious; and the author of the *β* text accordingly rejected so much of these verses as he could not assimilate to other and canonical parts of the N. T. There is no chronological reason why a fifth or sixth century version of the A. P. should not give these verses, as they stand in the Armenian Vulgate; for the last twelve verses of Mark were certainly

[1] The omission by *β* of καὶ βαπτισθεὶς in v. 16 recalls the Greek Descensus ad Inferos ii. 2 (Tisch. p. 325).

translated into Armenian in the fifth century. Eznik, one of the translators of the Bible in that century, quotes them, and they are read in Armenian bibles which go back to an early age. We may therefore explain this omission in *β* as a mere matter of recension. Being uncanonical, these verses are much less likely to have been added to the Armenian A. P. by a recensing hand than to have been taken away. It may be noticed however that in the later B text of the Greek Acts vv. 17 and 18 are similarly excluded, perhaps for a kindred reason.

So much for the omissions and additions which characterize *a* as compared with *β*. Yet another consideration in favour of its higher antiquity may be adduced. If there be a version, which at any time has been revised by fresh consultation of the original Greek, we shall surely be able, of two rival texts of it, as are *a* and *β*, to distinguish the more primitive by the survival in it of solecisms, which the revising hand will have removed from the less ancient text. Of this rule we have an example in ch. ix. 2, where Tischendorf reads καὶ νῦν καταγγέλλετέ μου ὅτι βασιλέα μισῶ. Here *a* translates καὶ νῦν καταγελᾶτέ μου, 'and now you laugh at me'; but *β* has a reading which gives very good sense, and is found in the old Latin version: 'et nunc dicitis mihi.' Some Greek sources have also: καὶ νῦν καταλέγετέ μου. Here καταγελᾶτε of *a* is too obviously wrong for the reviser to have substituted it for λέγετέ μοι. We may conclude that *a*, which contains the solecism, is more primitive than *β*, which is without it. It cannot, of course, be explained as a corruption which has grown up within the Armenian text itself.

My object in translating *a* and *β* respectively into Greek and Latin is simply to add to our knowledge of the sources of the text of the A. P. I have not chosen Latin as the medium into which to render *β*, because I suppose it to be a recension according to Latin texts; but merely to avoid the labour of a second Greek translation. I preferred to retranslate *a* into Greek rather than into Latin, because many shades of

meaning, especially in regard to the use of the article, can be ill-rendered in a Latin dress.

The Armenian version clearly reflects a very primitive text of the A. P. In analyzing the passage from cap. xv. 5, we saw that the texts *a* and *β*, even where they disagree, yet cut across the other sources; following no one in particular, but going from one to the other. This feature is still more marked in those passages wherein *a* and *β* agree. The Armenian text leaps from manuscript to manuscript, from version to version. In a few passages I have added footnotes to point out the dispersion throughout other sources of readings lying together in the Armenian.

The weakness of Tischendorf's Greek and Latin texts lies in this, that they are not real texts which ever existed, but pieced together by him from one source after another, according to his judgement of how the text should run. I hope that any one trying to unravel the interrelations of the other sources will find my work of use. Where the texts *a* and *β* coincide, we have certainly a witness to the text of respectable antiquity. The narrative of the crucifixion contained in the Acts of Pilate is a rough harmony of the four Gospels. If they be the same Acts to which Justin Martyr and Tertullian allude, they must contain evidence as to the condition in the first half of the second century of the text of the N. T. which should not be neglected, and which indeed merits to be set alongside of the more extended harmony of Tatian.

Here is not the place to argue the question of the antiquity of the A. P. It would seem, however, that the late Bishop Lightfoot, in his anxiety to save the credit of Tertullian as a critic, passes a very hasty judgement upon the A. P[1]. A text which at so early a date presents

[1] Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, vol. i. p. 55: 'It is a mistake to suppose that he (Tertullian) quotes the extant spurious *Acta Pilati* as genuine (Apol. 21 'ea omnia super Christo Pilatus . . . Caesari tunc Tiberio nuntiavit'). Tertullian, like his predecessor Justin M. (Apol. i. 35, p. 76 and i. 48, p. 84), *assumes* that the Roman Archives contained an official report sent by Pontius Pilate to Tiberius.

so many varieties of reading must have had a long history behind it, even if we take into account the fact of its being popular and uncanonical. Tischendorf, in his prolegomena (p. lxii ff.), adduces a continuous chain of testimony to the 'extant forgery,' as Lightfoot terms our A. P., from Justin Martyr up to Gregorius Turonensis. This chain of testimony may also be strengthened. For example, the very archaic fragment of a homily De Latrone preserved in Armenian, and ascribed to the philosopher Aristides, author of the famous Apology, almost certainly contains a reference to the Acts of Pilate, for these alone inform us that it was the right-hand thief who repented. For this extra-canonical detail we look everywhere in vain except in the A. P. ch. xii. 2. In Aristides de Latrone (Venice, 1878) we read: 'Remember me, Lord, in thy kingdom. . . . This day with me shalt thou be in the garden. . . . And now I pray you all, friends of the Christian race, to be instructed by the faith of the right-hand thief and to agree with him. Despise the left-hand one and his associates. For he held aloof from the voice of the crucified one, and has not in common with him the ancient, right-handed, and beautifully equipped mansion; but has withdrawn himself to the left hand, and stations himself

He is not referring to any definite literary work which he had read. The extant forgery was founded on these notices of the early fathers and not conversely.' The answer to be returned to this criticism is fourfold: (1) On any but a forced interpretation of their language Justin M. and Tertullian *do* allude to a document which they had seen. (2) Their critical sagacity need not have been so ample as to prevent their supposing that the extant document constituted the genuine Acts. Theirs was an age and school of criticism which believed the Enoch Apocryph to have been written before the flood, the prophecies of the Christian Sibyll to have been uttered in the remotest antiquity. (3) A Christian forger later than Tertullian would not have written A. P. ch. ii, (pp. 26, 27), as it stands in the A form. (4) He would not have represented the ascension as taking place on the Mount Mambrek or Mamelech in Galilee, but would have followed the canonical text which located it on the Mount of Olives near Jerusalem. The absence from the oldest texts of the A. P. of any attempt to harmonize their narrative with the canonical text is a sign that they were composed before the N. T. canon was fixed, i. e. before A. D. 150 or 160.

there. Concerning each of these robbers the expositions are near at hand for you, and are constantly paraphrased and read aloud in the priestly books (et recognoscuntur in sacerdotalibus litteris).' This passage seems to put back ch. x of the A. P. as far as A. D. 130–150, and is our earliest reference to it. Next we have the testimony—according to Tischendorf incontestable—of Justin Martyr and Tertullian. In the reign of Decius we meet with a reference to the A. P. in the Acts of Polyeuctes, which, though only embedded in a homily of about A. D. 363, seems to be in essential respects a document of A. D. 260 or earlier. In these Acts (see *Polyeucte dans l'histoire*, par B. Aubé, Paris, 1882) Nearchus, the friend of the martyr, says: 'Yes, and thou mayest remember yet another incident . . . and this is from the *history* of the Lord. Bethink thee of the thief who was crucified on the right-hand side; what did he say to the thief who was crucified on the left, and who reviled the Lord?' The 'history of the Lord' in question was probably the A. P., which in the oldest copies bear the title *ὑπομνήματα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πραχθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου.*

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

A. P. = Acta Pilati.
P. E. = Pseudo-Petri Evangelium.
α = Paris Codex Armenus 44.
β = " " " 88.
γ = Venice Armenian Codex of A.P.

In the critical notes at the foot of page the references to Greek, Latin, and Coptic sources are taken from the *Evangelia Apocrypha* of Tischendorf, Lipsiae, 1876.

Square brackets in the Greek version of α signify lacunae due to abrasion of the paper of the MS.

Round brackets in the Greek version of α mark passages absent in β.

Square brackets in the Latin version of β mark passages omitted in α.

Italicized passages in the Latin of β are those in which it presents significant differences of text from α other than actual omissions or additions.

Heavier type in the Greek of α indicates a verbal identity of α with the text of the Armenian Vulgate.

ACTA PILATI.

Ὑπομνήματα ἃ [1] ἦσαν [2] ἔμπροσθεν Ποντίου Πιλάτου [3] (περὶ τῆς ἀνασταυρώσεως [4] τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) [5]. [a] Tisch. p. 210.

Ἐν ἔτει ἐννεακαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας (Τιβερίου) Καίσαρος βασιλέως [a]Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ἡρώδου τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἡρώδου [6] ὃς [ἦν] βασιλεὺς τῆς Γαλιλαίας [b] ἐν [ἐννεα-]καιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ. καὶ τῇ πρὸ [7] ἐννέα καλανδῶν Ἀρὲγ [8] μηνὸς ἥτις ἦν εἰκὰς καὶ πέμπτη ἐν ὑπατείᾳ [b] Lu. 3. 1 and 23. 7.

Memoriae quae fuerunt [de Christo] coram Pontio Pilato [praeside Iudaeae].

In anno *octavo* decimo [9] imperii Caesaris regis Graecorum [10], et Herodis filii Herodis, qui erat rex Galilaeorum, in nono decimo imperii eius et ante quam *octo* kalendarum *Arnu*, quod in vicesimo quinto

---

[1] The words rendered ἃ ἦσαν might also = τὰ γενόμενα. F H have πραχθέντα; C has ἃ ἐπράχθησαν.

[2] β ἦσαν περὶ Χριστοῦ.

[3] β adds τοῦ ἡγεμόνος τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

[4] περὶ τ. ἀναστ. is absent from the Greek; only D adds εἰς τὴν ἀποκαθήλωσιν which might underlie the Arm.

[5] Χριστοῦ] C adds a prologue beginning ἐγὼ Ἀνανίας. Also Copt.; but A D E F G H I agree with Arm. in omitting it.

[6] καὶ Ἡ. τ. υἱ. Ἡ. cum E Lat.

[7] τῇ π. ἐ. καλ. cum A Lat.

[8] Ἀρέγ] The Arm. month արեգ might answer to any Western month according to the year. All the Greek sources except A add Ἀπριλλίων after καλανδῶν. Latin *Aprilis*.

---

[9] The Greek codices D E have ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ. The Latin codices and Coptic have ἐννεακαιδεκάτῳ with *a*. The rest of the Greek codices have πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ.

[10] γ adds *Tiberii*.

῾Ρούφου, καὶ ῾Ρουβελινοῦ[1] *ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει αὐτῆς*[2], *καὶ*[3] *δυοῖν ἡγεμόνων*[4] *ἀρχιερέων τῶν ᾽Ιουδαίων, ῎Αννα καὶ Καιάφα. Καὶ ὅσα μετὰ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὸ πάθος τοῦ Κυρίου, ἱστόρησεν Νικόδημος τὰ γενόμενα τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ᾽Ιουδαίοις· (καὶ ἔταξεν Νικόδημος*[5],) *῎Αννᾳ καὶ Καιάφᾳ, καὶ Σίμωνι, καὶ Δώθᾳ*[6]; *(καὶ Γαμαλιήλ,) ᾽Ιούδας, Λευί, Νεφθαλίμ, ᾽Αλέξανδρος*

Hromphae[7], *ante Babelonis*[8], in quarto anno eius et duorum principum sacerdotum Iudaeorum, Annae et Caiaphae. Et quanta post crucem et passionem domini, historiatus[9] est Nicodemus quae facta sunt summis sacerdotum aliisque Iudaeis, Annae et Caiaphae et Simeôni, et Dôkae[10], Iudas, Levi, Nepthalim,

---

[1] *῾Ρούφ. κ. ῾Ρουβ.*] Greek A I G C, Latin Copt. correspond; but B has *Βικεντιανοῦ* and E omits entire passage. The spelling Rubellinum preserved in the Fasti Siculi is closest to the Arm.

[2] *αὐτῆς*] Arm. may also = *αὐτοῦ*; E has *τῆς αὐτῆς ὀλυμπιάδος*; but other sources have *τῆς διακοσιοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος*. D omits entire clause.

[3] *καί*] other sources have *ἐπί*.

[4] *δυοῖν ἡγ.*] Greek sources omit or have simply *ἐπί*; the Latin has *sub principatu sacerdotum.*

[5] *ἱστόρησεν* usque *Νικόδημος*] So E which has *ἱστ. Νικ. τὰ πεπρ. τοῖς ᾽Ιουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι, συνέταξεν ὁ αὐτὸς Νικ.* All the Greek sources, except D which omits the entire passage, add *γράμμασιν ῾Εβραϊκοῖς.* So Latin and Copt.

[6] In C G I, in Latin and Copt. which are nearest to Arm., Annas and Caiaphas and Simon and Dotha are of the number of those who went before Pilate, and are therefore like Gamaliel and the rest put in nom. case at the beginning of a new paragraph. They are, according to the Arm., the recipients of Nicodemus' instructions. Perhaps *ἔταξεν* is a mistranslation of *συνέταξεν* and led to the four first names being put in the dative. Tischendorf following A F H adds before *῎Αννας* the words *συμβούλιον γὰρ ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς.*

---

[7] *γ* reads *Romae.*

[8] An obvious corruption of *Rubellionis.*

[9] *γ* reads *et hist.*

[10] In *α* and *β* the proper names as far as *Dôkae* are in the dative. From *Iudas* they are in the nominative case.

(καὶ Ἰάριος) καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ[1] τῶν Ἰουδαίων, (καὶ) ἦλθον ἔμπροσθεν Πιλάτου κατηγοροῦντες τοῦ αὐτοῦ[2] περὶ πολλῶν πράξεων κακῶν (λέγοντες)· οἴδαμεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν[3] Ἰωσὴφ[4] ἀπὸ Μαριὰμ γεννηθέντα[5], καὶ λέγει ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ[a] καὶ βασιλέα· οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο[6], ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σάββατα βεβηλοῖ[b], καὶ τὴν πατρίαν θρησκείαν ἡμῶν[7] καταλῦσαι βούλεται. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· τί ἐστιν[8] ὃ πράττει καὶ βούλεται καταλῦσαι; Λέγουσιν[9] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· νόμον ἔχομεν ἐν σαββάτῳ μὴ θεραπεῦσαι τινα· οὗτος δὲ χωλοὺς[10], τυφλοὺς[c] καὶ παραλυτικοὺς καὶ[11] λεπρούς, καὶ δαιμονιζομένους[12] ἐθεράπευσεν ἐν σαββάτῳ

[a] Lu. 23. 2 and Jno. 19. 7.
[b] Mat. 12. 5.
[c] Mat. 11. 5 and Lu. 7. 22.

Alexander[13], atque alii Iudaeorum venerunt coram Pilato, accusabant omne[14] de multis actionibus malis. Novimus Iesum filium Iosephi [fabri][15] ex Maria natum, et dicit se filium Dei et regem. Et non solum hoc, sed et sabbata dissolvit et paternam relligionem nostram destruere vult[16].

Dicit illis Pilatus: Quid est quod agit et vult destruere?

Dicunt [illi] Iudaei: Legem habemus in sabbato non curare aliquem; sed ille claudos [et prostratos],

---

[1] *οἱ λοιποί*] Arm. = *alii*.

[2] *τοῦ αὐτοῦ*] All other sources have or imply *τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* here.

[3] *υἱόν*] So G and Latini; others add *ὄντα* before it or *ὀνομαζόμενον*.

[4] *β* adds *τοῦ τέκτονος*.

[5] *ἀπὸ Μ. γεν.*] Cum C G Copto Latinis.

[6] *οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο*] So C D G I and Latini.

[7] *νόμον ἡμῶν* cum A Copto Latinis ... C G om. *ἡμῶν*.

[8] *τί ἐστιν ὅ*] A.

[9] *β* adds *αὐτῷ*.

[10] *β* adds *et prostratos*.

[11] *β* om. *καί* before *λεπρούς*.

[12] *χωλοὺς ... δαιμ.*] So G only adding *καὶ κυρτούς* after *καὶ τυφλ.* The Latin codices A B reflect G, but the Latin C which has *claudos caecos paralyticos leprosos et daemoniosos* is the only source which exactly agrees with Arm.

---

[13] *γ* adds *et Iarios*.

[14] The word in *β*, *զամենայն* = *omne*, must be a corruption of *զնմանէ* = *eum*.

[15] All the sources except *a* have *fabri*.

[16] *γ* has *vult dest.*

ἀπὸ κακῶν πράξεων. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· ποίων πράξεων κακῶν[1]; Λέγουσιν αὐτοί· γόης ἐστίν, καὶ ἐν[2] τῷ ἄρχοντι[3] **δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια**[a], **καὶ πάντα αὐτῷ ὑποτάσσεται**[b].

Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· τοῦτο οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν ἀκαθάρτῳ πνεύματι ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς[4] τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ[5].

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Πιλάτῳ· ἀξιοῦμεν τὸ σὸν μέγεθος ὥστε αὐτὸν παραστῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος[c] σου καὶ ἀκούσατε αὐτοῦ[6]. προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Πιλᾶτος τοὺς Ἰουδαίους[7] λέγει αὐτοῖς[d]· πῶς δύναμαι ἐγὼ ἀνὴρ[8] ἡγεμὼν βασιλέα ἐξετάσαι; Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἡμεῖς οὐ

[a] Mat. 9. 34 and Lu. 11. 15.
[b] Lu. 10. 17 and Paul 1 Cor. 15. 27.
[c] Mat. 27. 19 and Jno. 19. 13.
[d] Jno. 19. 15.

caecos et paralyticos, leprosos et daemoniosos curavit in sabbato malis operibus. Dicit illis Pilatus: quibus operibus malis?

Dicunt: Maleficus est [et Beelzebulo] principe daemonum eiicit daemones, et sunt omnia huic subiecta. Dicit illis Pilatus: Istud non est in immundo spiritu eiicere daemones, sed in *deo* Asclepio.

Dicunt Iudaei Pilato: Precamur tuam magnitudinem, ut veniat stet ante tribunal tuum et audiatis illum. Vocavit ad sese Pilatus Iudaeos et dicit ad illos: Quomodo possum ego vir praeses regem interrogare?

---

[1] λέγ. αὐτοῖς ὁ Π. π. π. κ.; Λέγ. αὐτ.] cum G Copt. Latt. . . A C om.

[2] β ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἄρχ.

[3] All other sources add Βεελζεβοὺλ either before or after τῷ ἄρχοντι, but C omits ἄρχ. τ. δαιμ.

[4] β τῷ θεῷ.

[5] ἀλλ' . . . Ἀσκληπιῷ] So most sources, but G E omit, and Copt. et multi Codd. Latini *sed in virtute* (*nomine*) *dei*. For the plural however τοῖς θεοῖς the other sources have τῷ θεῷ.

[6] ὥστε usque ἀκούσατε αὐτοῦ] The Arm. literally = *ut venerit et steterit coram tribunali vostro et audieritis ab illo*. This combines the readings of C G E Copt. Latt. ὥστε αὐ. παραστ. τῷ βήματί σου καὶ ἀκουσθῆναι with that of D which is ὥστε αὐ. παραστ. ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματός σου καὶ ἐρωτηθῆναι παρὰ σοῦ.

[7] προσκ. ὁ Π. τ. Ἰουδ.] So A (only adding δέ after προσκ., where others add καί before it) and Lat. Flor.: *Advocans ad se Pilatus Iudaeos dicit eis*.

[8] ἀνήρ] Not in Greek or Latin.

λέγομεν αὐτὸν βασιλέα[a], ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸς[b] λέγει ἑαυτόν[1]. προσκαλεσάμενος δὲ[2] ὁ Πιλᾶτος τὸν κούρσωρα λέγει[3]· μετὰ ἐπιεικείας εἰσελθέτω ὁ Ἰησοῦς. ἐξελθὼν ὁ κούρσωρ καὶ γνωρίσας αὐτὸν προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ καὶ λαβὼν τὸ φακεόλιον[4] τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἥπλωσε χαμαὶ[5] καὶ λέγει· Κύριε, ἐπὶ τούτου[6] περιπάτησον[7] καὶ εἴσελθε, ὅτι[8] ὁ ἡγεμὼν καλεῖ σε[9]. ἰδόντες[10] δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ὃ ἐποίησεν ὁ κούρσωρ[11] κατέκραξαν λέγοντες τῷ Πιλάτῳ[12]· διατί ὑπὸ πραίκωνος[13] οὐκ εἰσήγαγες αὐτὸν[14] ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ κούρσωρος;

[a] Jno. 19. 5.
[b] Lu. 23. 2.

Dicunt illi: nos negamus de illo, quod rex est, sed ipse dicit de sese. Vocavit Pilatus cursorem, et dicit [illi]: cum moderatione ingrediatur Iesus.

Quum exisset cursor foras et agnosset illum, et tollens faciale in manu suo expandit in terra et dicit: Domine super hoc ambula et ingredere intra, quia *vocat te praeses.* Et quum vidissent illud[15] Iudaei quod fecit cursor, clamaverunt *Pilato et dicunt*: Cur tortore non introducebas illum intra, sed cursore? Nam

---

[1] *Λέγουσιν* usque *ἑαυτόν*] So in general C D E G Copt. Flor. Vatt. The Arm. answers in particular to C E G in omitting *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* after *αὐτῷ*, to G in reading *αὐτὸν βασιλέα*, to D in omitting *εἶναι* after *βασιλέα*, to C D E in retaining *αὐτός*, to none in reading *λέγει* before *ἑαυτόν* instead of after.

[2] *β* om. *δέ*.

[3] *β* adds *αὐτῷ*.

[4] *φακεόλιον*] So D E F H, Latini *fasciale*. Other sources have *καθάπλωμα*.

[5] *ἥπ. χ.*] Cum A D et Latinis.

[6] *ἐπὶ τ.*] So Latin *super hoc*. Greek sources have various readings.

[7] *περιπ.*] Arm. = *incede*.

[8] *ὁ ἡγ. κ. σε*] So Latin *quia praeses vocat te*. Greek has order *καλεῖ σε ὁ ἡγ.*

[9] *β* has order *καλ. ὁ ἡγ.*

[10] *β* adds *τοῦτο* or *ἐκεῖνο*.

[11] *κατέκ.* usque *Πιλάτῳ*] This agrees best with D: *κατέκραξαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον λέγοντες*. Most sources have *κατέκ. τοῦ Πιλάτου λέγοντες*. So also many Latin sources, but not all.

[12] *β* has *τοῦ Πιλάτου λέγοντες*.

[13] *πραίκ.*] The Arm. word answers rather to *βασανιστοῦ*.

[14] *οὐκ εἰσήγ. αὐ.*] The Latin A B C *Cur eum praeconis sub voce non ingredi fecisti* best answers to the Arm. The Greek sources have *ἐκέλευσας* or *ἐκάλεσας εἰσελθεῖν*.

---

[15] *γ* om. *illud*.

καὶ γὰρ ὁ κούρσωρ θεασάμενος αὐτὸν προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ[1] καὶ τὸ φακεόλιον ὃ εἶχεν[2] ἥπλωσεν χαμαὶ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Κύριε, καλεῖ σε ὁ ἡγεμών[3].

Ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος καλεσάμενος τὸν κούρσωρα λέγει αὐτῷ· τί ἐποίησας τοῦτο; Λέγει αὐτῷ[4], ὅτε ἀπεστειλάμην[5] ἐγὼ[6] εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ πρὸς τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον εἶδον καθήμενον αὐτὸν[7] ἐπὶ ὄνου, καὶ οἱ παῖδες Ἰουδαίων ἔκραζον, ἔχοντες **κλάδους**[a] ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν[8]· ἄλλοι δὲ **ὑπεστρώννυον**[b] **τὰ ἱμάτια** αὐτῶν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ[9] λέγοντες· **δόξα**[c] **ἐν ὑψίστοις**[10]· **εὐλογημένος ὃς ἔρχει ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.**

[a] Mat. 21. 8. [b] Lu. 19. 36 and Mat. 21. 8. [c] Lu. 19. 38.

cursor quum vidit illum, adoravit illum, et faciale quod habebat [in manu], expandit in terra et dixit: Domine, vocat te praeses.

Vocavit cursorem Pilatus, et dicit illi: Quid *fecisti* istud?

Dicit cursor: Quo tempore missi sumus in Ierusalem ad Alexandrum, vidi illum sedentem super asinum et pueri Iudaeorum clamabant habentes ramos in manibus suis, et alii sternebant vestimenta sua ante illum, et dicebant: Gloria in excelsis, beatus qui venis in nomine Domini.

---

[1] αὐτῷ] So Latin. Greek omits.

[2] ὃ εἶχεν (*quod habebat*)] So Latin forms add *quod gerebat* (or *tenebat*) *in manu*. But Arm. *a* has not *in manu*. Greek has αὐτοῦ simply.

[3] καὶ εἶπεν usque ἡγ.] So F H and Latin D[abc] *et dixit ei Domine vocat te praeses*; but other Latin sources and rest of Greek have καὶ ὡς βασιλέα αὐτὸν περιπατῆσαι πεποίηκεν or similar.

[4] β has ὁ κούρσωρ and om. αὐτῷ.

[5] ἀπεστειλάμην ἐγώ] A and Latini have με ἀπέστειλας, other sources ἀπέστειλάς με.

[6] β om. ἐγώ.

[7] β has αὐτ. καθήμ.

[8] ἔκραζον usque αὐτῶν] So D and less closely the Lat. D[abc].

[9] ἔμπ. αὐτοῦ] Not in Greek; perhaps it = Lat. *in via*.

[10] δόξα ἐν ὑ.] This is nearest to A ὡσαννὰ ἐν τ. ὑ. The other Greek sources and also Latin have σῶσον δή, ὁ ἐν τ. ὑ. or similar. But the B form of the Acts omits the latter and agrees with Arm.

Ἔκραζον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ λέγουσιν τῷ κούρσωρι· Ἑβραίων[1] *μὲν οἱ παῖδες ἑβραϊστὶ ἔλεγον*[2], *σοὶ δὲ πόθεν ἦν γιγνώσκειν*[3] *τὸ ἑλληνιστί*[4]*; Λέγει (αὐτοῖς)*[5] *ὁ κούρσωρ· ἠρώτησά τινα τῶν Ἑβραίων καὶ εἶπα· τί (ἐστιν ὃ) κράζουσιν*[6] *ἑβραιστί; κἀκεῖνος ἑρμήνευσέν μοι. Λέγει αὐτοῖς*[7] *ὁ Πιλᾶτος· πῶς ἔκραζον*[8]*; Λέγουσιν*[9] *αὐτῷ*[10]*·* δόξα[11] *ἐν ὑψίστοις*[a] *θεῷ*[12]. *Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· εἰ ὑμεῖς μαρτυρεῖτε τὰς φωνὰς*[13] *τὰς παρὰ τῶν παίδων*[14] *κραζομένας*[15], *τί ἥμαρτεν ὁ κούρσωρ; οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπησαν.*

[a] Lu. 19. 38.

Clamaverunt Iudaei dicentes ad cursorem: Hebraeorum pueri hebraice *clamabant*: sed tibi unde τὸ Romane? Dicit cursor: Interrogavi quendam ex Iudaeis et dixi: Quid clamant hebraice? et ille exposuit mihi. Dicit *ei* Pilatus: Quomodo clamabant [hebraice]? Dic*it* ei: Gloria in excelsis. Dicit eis Pilatus: Si vos attestatis [ipsi] vocem quae ab infantibus *dicta* est, quid peccavit cursor? Illi autem

---

[1] β *τῶν Ἑβρ.* [2] β *ἔκραζον.* [3] β om. *ἦν γιγν.*

[4] *σοί* usque *ἑλληνιστί*] This is closest to Latin sources A B C, especially C, which have *unde tibi gentili* (C om.) *hoc* (B *est hoc*) *nosse*, but the order is that of Latin D[ac] *tu autem cum sis Graecus, quomodo linguam hebraeam nosti?* Similarly the Arm. unites features from each of the various forms which the sentence assumes in the Greek, e.g. *σοί* from B F, the order *σοὶ πόθεν* from A, *γινώσκειν* from B, *τὸ ἑλληνιστί* from B F and A, also Copt. Note that the Latin follows C E, which have *ἑβραιστί* instead of *ἑλληνιστί*.

[5] β om. *αὐτοῖς.* [6] β has *τί κράζ.* and om. *ἐστιν ὅ.*

[7] β *αὐτῷ.* [8] β adds *Ἑβραιστί.* [9] β *λέγει.*

[10] *λέγ. αὐ.*] So C . . . the rest add *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι.*

[11] *δόξα* usque *θεῷ*] The nearest to this is the Latin 'Osanna in excelsis.' The Greek sources have *ὡσαννά· μεμβρονῆ. βαρουχαννᾶ. ἀδοναί. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· Καὶ τὸ ὡσαννὰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τί ἑρμηνεύεται; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· σῶσον δή, ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.* The Latin have the same addition. The Greek A D omit the whole passage beginning from *λέγει αὐ. ὁ Π. π. ἔκρ.*

[12] β om. *θεῷ.* [13] β *τὴν φωνὴν τήν.*

[14] *κραζομένας*] So Latin *voces et verba quibus ab infantibus acclamatum est* . . . Greek has *λεχθείσας.* [15] β *λεγομένην.*

Λέγει[1] (ὁ Πιλᾶτος) τῷ κούρσωρι· ἔξελθε καὶ ὥσπερ βούλει εἰσάγαγε αὐτόν. Ἐκβὰς ὁ κούρσωρ ἐποίησεν κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον σχῆμα καὶ[2] λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ· Κύριε,
[a] Mat. 27. 2. εἴσελθε· ὅτι ὁ ἡγεμὼν[a] καλεῖ σε.

Εἰσελθόντος δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν σιγνοφόρων κατεχόντων τὰ σίγνα, ἔκαμψαν τὰ σίγνα τὰς προτομὰς ἑαυτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Χριστῷ[3]. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ Ἑβραῖοι ([4] τὸ σχῆμα τῶν σίγνων, ἅπερ ἐκάμφθησαν καὶ προσεκύ-
[b] Mar. 15. 14. νησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ[4]), περισσῶς[b] ἔκραζον[c] κατὰ τῶν σιγνο-
[c] Mat. 27. 23. φόρων. ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος λέγει πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους[5]· οὐ θαυμάζετε πῶς ἔκαμψαν τὰ σίγνα τὰς προτομὰς ἑαυτῶν[6], ἀλλὰ κράζετε κατὰ τῶν σιγνοφόρων, ὥσπερ εἰ αὐτοὶ ἔκαμψαν[7]; λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Πιλάτῳ· ἡμεῖς

tacuerunt. [Deinde] dicit[8] cursori: Egredere et quomodocumque vis introduc eum. Exiens cursor fecit secundum prius schema, et dicit ad Iesum: Domine ingredere, quia praeses vocat te.

Ingresso Iesu, signiferi tenebant signa et curvaverunt signa capita sua et adoraverunt *Iesum*. Videntes autem Iudaei amplius clamabant adversus signiferos. Pilatus vero dicit ad Iudaeos: Non miramini quomodo incurvaverunt signa capita sua [et adoraverunt Iesum]? Sed clamatis adversus signiferos, quasi ipsi curvaverint [et adoraverint]. Dicunt Iudaei ad Pilatum: Nos vidimus *quemad-*

---

[1] β τότε λέγει and om. ὁ Πιλ. [2] β om. *καί*.
[3] β τῷ Ἰησοῦ. [4] β omits words bracketed.
[5] I have written Ἰουδαίους here and elsewhere, because Tischendorf's text has it and it was pedantic to alter it. But it may be noticed that the Armenian has but one word Hreajk to render both Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑβραῖος and their derivatives.
[6] β adds *καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.* [7] β adds *καὶ προσεκύνησαν.*

---

[8] γ adds praeses.

εἴδομεν πῶς ἔκαμψαν οἱ σιγνοφόροι προσκυνῆσαι[1] τῷ Ἰησοῦ. προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ ἡγεμὼν[a] τοὺς σιγνοφόρους λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί οὕτως ἐποιήσατε[a]; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἡμεῖς ἄνδρες Ἕλληνές ἐσμεν ἱερόδουλοι[2], πῶς προσεκυνήσαμεν αὐτῷ; καὶ γὰρ κατεχόντων ἡμῶν τὰ σίγνα ἐκάμφθησαν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ[3].

Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος[4]· ἐκλέξασθε ὑμεῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνδρας δυνατοὺς καὶ κραταιούς, καὶ αὐτοὶ κατάσχωσιν τὰ σίγνα, καὶ ἴδωμεν εἰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς κάμπτονται. ἐκλεξάμενοι δὲ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἄνδρας δώδεκα δυνατούς[5], ἀνὰ ἓξ ἓξ ἐποίησαν κατασχεῖν τὰ σίγνα, καὶ ἐστάθησαν[b] ἔμπροσθεν **τοῦ βήματος**[c] *τοῦ ἡγέμονος. λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος τῷ κούρσωρι· ἔκβαλε αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ* **πραιτωρίου**[d], *καὶ εἰσάγαγε αὐτὸν πάλιν, ὥσπερ καὶ σὺ βούλει. καὶ ἐξῆλθον ἔξω τοῦ πραιτωρίου ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ*

[a] Mat. 27. 2.
[b] Mat. 27. 11.
[c] Mat. 27. 19.
[d] Mat. 27. 27 and Jno. 18. 28.

modum inclinaverunt signiferi *et adoraverunt* Iesum. Advocans praeses signiferos dicit eis: Quare sic fecistis[6]? Dicunt illi: Nos viri gentiles sumus [et] templorum servi: quomodo adora*mus* eum? nam nobis tenentibus signa curvata sunt et adoraverunt eum.

Dicit Pilatus *synagogae*: Eligite vos ex vobis viros *potentes et fortes*, et ipsi teneant signa, et vid*emus* si ex se curventur. Et elegerunt seniores Iudaeorum viros duodecim fortes [potentesque], et senos senos fecerunt tenere signa, et steterunt ante tribunal[7] praesidis. Dicit Pilatus cursori: Eiice istum foris praetorium, et intromitte iterum quomodo tu volueris. Et exivit foras praetorium Iesus et curso*rum princeps*.

---

[1] β καὶ προσεκύνησαν. [2] β καὶ ἱερόδ. [3] β αὐτῷ instead of τῷ Ἰησ. [4] β λέγ. ὁ Π. τῷ πλήθει. [5] β κραταιοὺς καὶ δυνατούς.

---

[6] γ *fec. sic.* [7] γ om. *trib.*

ὁ κούρσωρ. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ ἡγεμὼν τοὺς κατέχοντας τὰ σίγνα λέγει αὐτοῖς· ὤμοσα κατὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος, ὅτι ἐὰν καμφθῶσιν τὰ σίγνα εἰσιόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀποτεμῶ τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν. καὶ ἐκέλευσεν (ὁ ἡγεμὼν[1]) εἰσελθεῖν (τὸν Ἰησοῦν[2]) ἐκ δευτέρου. καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ κούρσωρ κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον σχῆμα, καὶ πολλὰ παρεκάλεσεν ὁ κούρσωρ τὸν Ἰησοῦν[2] ἵνα ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ φακεωλίου[3]. εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἐκάμφθησαν τὰ σίγνα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

CAPUT II.

Ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος[4] ἰδὼν ἔμφοβος γενόμενος ἐβουλεύετο[5] ἀναστῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος[a]. ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμουμένου ἀναστῆναι, ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἔπεμψεν πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγουσα·

[a] Mat. 27. 19.

Vocavit ad se praeses [viros] qui signa tenebant, dixitque eis: Iuravi per Caesarem, quia, si inclinant se signa quando intrat Iesus, amputabo capita vestra. Et iussit[6] ingredi secunda vice. Et fecit curs*orum princeps* ad prius schema, et multum precabatur ut ambularet super faciale Iesus et ingrederetur. Introeunte autem, iterum inclinaverunt se signa ex sese et[7] adoraverunt Iesum.

CAPUT II.

Ut vero[8] vidit Pilatus, extimuit, voluit surgere de tribunali. Dum vero ille cogitabat surgere, uxor sua misit ad illum dicens: Nihil stat tibi et homini

---

[1] β om. ὁ ἡγεμών. [2] β om. τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

[3] β adds ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἰσέλθῃ.

[4] The text of Mat. runs thus: Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, λέγουσα, μηδέν σοι καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ· πολλὰ γὰρ ἔπαθον σήμερον κατ' ὄναρ δι' αὐτόν. Where for σήμερον the Cop. (item Ar[P] Pers.) read 'hac nocte.'

[5] β ἐθέλησεν.

---

[6] γ adds *praeses.* [7] γ = *et ex sese.* [8] γ omits.

μηδέν σοι καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ· πολλὰ γὰρ[a] ἐκακούμην[1] τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ. Ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος προσκαλεσάμενος ἅπαντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους λέγει αὐτοῖς· οἴδατε ὅτι ἡ γυνή μου θεοσεβής ἐστιν καὶ (μᾶλλον)[2] Ἰουδαία[3]. λέγουσιν (αὐτῷ)[4]· Ναί, οἴδαμεν. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· ἰδοὺ ἔπεμψεν πρὸς ἐμὲ[5] λέγουσα· μηδέν σοι καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ. (πολλὰ[6] γὰρ ἔπαθον[7] ἐν ταύτῃ[8] τῇ νυκτί, καὶ ἔγνων ὅτι οὗτός ἐστι κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν)[b][9].

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι[10] τῷ Πιλάτῳ[11]· μὴ εἴπαμέν σοι ὅτι γόης ἐστίν; ἰδοὺ ὀνειροπόλημα ἔπεμψε τῇ γυναικί σου[12].

Ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος προσκαλεσάμενος[13] αὐτοὺς[14] λέγει αὐτῷ· τί οὗτοι καταμαρτυροῦσίν[c] σου; οὐδὲν λαλεῖς[d];

[a] Mat. 27. 19.
[b] Ac. 10. 42.
[c] Mat. 26. 62 and 27. 13 and Mar. 14. 60.
[d] Mar. 15. 4.

iusto[15] isti: multa enim passa sum [propter eum] in hac nocte. Pilatus autem convocavit omnes Iudaeos et dicit eis: Scitis quia mulier mea cultrix dei est et Iudaea [est ea sicut vos]. Dicunt: immo scimus. Dicit eis Pilatus: Ecce misit ad me [uxor mea] dicens: Nihil stat tibi et [homini] illi iusto: Iudaei [autem responderunt et] dicunt Pilato: Non diximus tibi [prius] quia magus est? ecce misit somnium videndum uxori tuae.

Pilatus autem vocavit *Iesum* et dicit ei: Quid isti

---

1 β adds δι' αὐτόν.

2 β om. μᾶλλον.

3 β adds ἐστὶν ὥσπερ ὑμεῖς.

4 β om. αὐτῷ.

5 β adds ἡ γυνή μου.

6 β omits from πολλά down to καὶ νεκρῶν.

7 πολλὰ γ. ἔπ.] The Arm. literally = '*For many sufferings happened to me.*' So in the Arm. Vulgate. Just above the Greek phrase was rendered literally.

8 ἐν τ. τ. νυκ.] So Latin, *in hac nocte.* Greek simply νυκτός or διὰ τῆς νυκτός.

9 καὶ ἔγνων usque νεκρῶν] All other sources omit.

10 β has οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκριθέντες λέγ.

11 Λέγουσιν usque Πιλάτῳ] The Latin C is nearest to this.

12 ὀνειροπ. usque σου] Arm. literally = *somnium dedit uidere foeminae tui.*

13 β τὸν Ἰησοῦν for αὐτούς.

14 αὐτούς] Greek, Latin, Copt. have τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

---

15 γ omits *iusto.*

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς φησί· εἰ μὴ εἶχον ἐξουσίαν οὐκ ἂν ἐλάλουν· ἕκαστος γὰρ ἐξουσίαν ἔχει τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ [a] Mat. 27. 24. λαλεῖν ἀγαθά τε καὶ κακά· αὐτοὶ ὄψονται [a].

Ἀποκριθέντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Ἰουδαίων λέγουσιν Jno. 8. 41. τῷ Ἰησοῦ· τί ὀπτόμεθα (ἡμεῖς)[1]; πρῶτον ὅτι ἐκ πορνείας γεγέννησαι· δεύτερον ὅτι ἐν γεννήσει σου[2] Βηθλεεμαίων[3] ἡ ἀναίρεσις γέγονεν· τρίτον ὅτι ὁ πατήρ σου Ἰωσὴφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ σου Μαριὰμ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἔφυγον διότι μὴ εἶχον παρρησίαν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ λαοῦ.

[b] Lu. 2. 25 and Ac. 2. 5. Λέγουσίν τινες τῶν παρεστηκότων εὐλαβεῖς [b][4] ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ἡμεῖς οὐ λέγομεν ὅτι ἐκ πορνείας γέγονεν, ἀλλ' οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἐμνηστεύσατο Ἰωσὴφ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Μαριάμ, καὶ οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας. Λέγει ὁ

testificantur *propter te*? nihil loqueris? Iesus autem dicit: Si non haberent potestatem, non loquerentur. Quoniam unusquisque potestatem habet oris sui loqui bona et mala: et ipsi videbunt.

Responderunt seniores Iudaeorum et dicunt ad Iesum: Quid *videbimus*? primum quod ex fornicatione natus es: secundo quia in nativitatem tuam Bethleemensium trucidatio facta est: tertio, quod pater tuus Ioseph et mater tua Maria in Egyptum fugitivi fuerunt eo quod non haberent fiduciam in populo.

Dicunt quidam qui adstabant ex Iudaeis pii: Nos non dicimus quod ex fornicatione natus est, sed scimus quoniam desponsavit Ioseph matrem eius Mariam, et

---

[1] β has ὀψόμεθα and om. ἡμεῖς.

[2] ἐν γεν. σου] So Ven. Fabr. *pro (in) nativitate tua* and all Latin sources approximate. Greek has ἡ γέννησίς σου or ἡ σὴ γέννησις, but E has γεννηθέντος σου.

[3] Βηθλ.] A is nearest ἐν Βηθλεέμ. All other sources add νηπίων, *infantum*.

[4] β ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδ. εὐλ.

[1]Πιλᾶτος[2]· οὗτος ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν[3] ἀληθής[4] ἐστιν[5], καθὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν οἱ σύνεθνοι ὑμῶν[6]. Λέγουσιν τῷ Πιλάτῳ Ἄννας καὶ Καιάφας· ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος κράζομεν ὅτι ἐκ[7] πορνείας γεγέννηται[8], καὶ οὐ πιστεύεις, οὗτοι δὲ προσήλυτοί εἰσιν καὶ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

Λέγει Πιλᾶτος[9]· τί ἐστιν ὅτι προσήλυτοί εἰσιν[10];

Λέγουσιν[11]· Ἑλλήνων τέκνα ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ νῦν γεγόνασιν Ἰουδαῖοι. Ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ εἰπόντες ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πορνείας γεγέννηται· Λάζαρ[12] καὶ Ἀστέριος καὶ

non est natus ex fornicatione. Dicit Pilatus [ad Iudaeos qui dixerunt eum ex fornicatione natum esse]: Hic sermo vester [non] est verus [quoniam desponsatio facta est], sicut ipsi cognati vestri dicunt. Dicunt Pilato Annas et Caiaphas: omnis multitudo clamamus quoniam ex fornicatione natus est [et maleficus est] et non credis: isti autem proselyti sunt et discipuli eius.

Dicit Pilatus [Annae et Caiaphae]: quid sunt proselyti?

Dicunt [ei]: Gentilium filii sunt nati et modo facti sunt Iudaei. Responderunt ii qui dicebant quia non est de fornicatione natus, Lazarius et Asterius,

---

[1] Πιλᾶτος] All sources add πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς λέγοντας εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐκ πορνείας.

[2] β adds πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς λέγοντας περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐκ πορνείας γεγέννηται.

[3] ὑμῶν] All sources add οὐκ except A which has the question: ἀληθές ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα;

[4] ἀλ. ἐστιν] All sources add ὅτι ὁρμαστρα γέγοναν or similar.

[5] β οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλ. and adds ὅτι ὅρμαστρα γέγοναν. [6] β οἱ σύν. ὑμ. λέγ.

[7] ὅτι ἐκ usque πιστεύεις] So A and C E I (but these last transpose καὶ οὐ πιστεύεις, ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.). Other Greek sources as B have same order as C E I but read πιστευόμεθα. The Latin has for καὶ οὐ πιστ. *et maleficus est*.

[8] β adds *et maleficus est*.

[9] Λέγ. Πιλ.] The Latin C alone agrees: *Respondit Pilatus*.

[10] β adds πρὸς Ἄνναν καὶ Καιάφαν. [11] β τί εἰσιν προσήλυτοι.

[12] β adds αὐτῷ.

Ἀνδρόνικος[1] καὶ[2] Ἰάκωβος[3] καὶ Ζηρᾶς, Σαμουὴλ καὶ[4] Ἰσαὰκ καὶ[5] Φιλιής[6], καὶ Κρίσπος[7] καὶ Ἀγρίππας[8] καὶ Ἰούδας· ἡμεῖς προσήλυτοι οὐ γεγόναμεν, ἀλλὰ τέκνα Ἰουδαίων ἐσμὲν καὶ ἀλήθειαν[9] λαλοῦμεν[10].

Λέγει[11] ὁ Πιλᾶτος πρὸς τοὺς δώδεκα ἄνδρας[12] οἳ ἔλεγον ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας[13]· ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς κατὰ τῆς τύχης[14] Καίσαρος[15], εἰ ἀληθές ἐστιν ὃ [16]λέγετε[17]. Λέγουσιν τῷ Πιλάτῳ, νόμον ἔχομεν ματαίως[18] μὴ

Andronicus, Ianopus et Zeras, Samuel, Isaac, *Finees* et *Crospos* et Iudas: Nos proselyti non sumus facti, sed filii Iudaeorum sumus, et veritatem loquimur: [etenim in sponsalia Mariae et Iosephi interfuimus.]

Convocavit Pilatus duodecim viros qui dicebant quia non est de fornicatione natus [dicitque ad eos]: Adiuro vos per *vitam*[19] Caesaris, si verum est quod dicitis [quia non est de fornicatione natus].

Dicunt Pilato: Legem habemus non iurare vane,

---

[1] Ἀνδρόνικος] The other sources have Ἀντώνιος.

[2] β om. καί.

[3] β has Ἰάνωπος.

[4] β om. καί before Ἰσαάκ.

[5] Φιλιής] Other sources Φινεές.

[6] β Φινεές.

[7] β Κρόσπος.

[8] β om. καὶ Ἀγρ.

[9] After λαλοῦμεν B C E I Latt. add: Καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὰ ὅρμαστρα Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας παραγεγόναμεν. A omits.

[10] β adds Καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὰ ὅρμαστρα Μαρίας καὶ Ἰωσὴφ παραγεγόναμεν.

[11] β λέγει . . πορνείας] β has προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Πιλᾶτος τοὺς δώδεκα.

[12] Λέγει usque ἄνδρας] B C E I Latt. and Copt. have προσκαλούμενος δὲ ὁ Π. τοὺς δώδ. ἄνδ., and just below after πορνείας adds λέγει αὐτοῖς. But Greek A has γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Πιλᾶτος ὅτι ἀληθῆ εἰσὶ τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν λεγόμενα, λέγει αὐτοῖς.

[13] Tisch. reads τοὺς εἰπόντας ὅτι οὐ γεγ. ἐκ π. λέγει αὐτοῖς.

[14] τύχης] All other sources have σωτηρίας.

[15] β τῆς ζωῆς Καίσαρος.

[16] λέγετε] Greek, Latin and Copt. add ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας.

[17] β adds ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας.

[18] ματαίως] Other sources omit.

---

[19] This answers to the phrase εἰς τὴν ζωὴν τοῦ Καίσαρος found in form B of the A. P. However the Arm. word might render σωτηρίαν.

[1] ὀμνύειν[a], ὅτι ἁμαρτία ἐστίν[2]· οὗτοι ὀμόσουσιν[3] ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν καθὼς εἴπαμεν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔνοχοι[b] ἐσόμεθα θανάτου[4] [c].

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος πρὸς Ἄνναν καὶ Καϊάφαν· οὐκ ἔχετέ τι [5] ἀποκρίνεσθαι[6]; Λέγουσιν Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας πρὸς τὸν Πιλᾶτον· οἱ δώδεκα οὗτοι [7] πιστεύονται[8], ἡμεῖς[9] δὲ πάντες τὸ πλῆθος (κράζομεν)[10] ὅτι ἐκ πορνείας [11] γεγέννηται[12] καὶ λέγει ἑαυτὸν βασιλέα καὶ υἱὸν [13] θεοῦ[14] καὶ οὐ πιστεύεις ἡμῖν[15].

a Jas. 5. 12.
b Mat. 26. 66.
c Mat. 14. 64.

quia peccatum est. Isti iurent [per fortunam Caesaris] quia non est istud sicut diximus, et nos rei simus mortis. Dicit Pilatus Annae et Caiaphae: Nihil habetis respondere [ad hoc].

Dicunt Annas et Caiaphas ad Pilatum: Hi duodecim credibiles sunt [quoniam non est natus ex fornicatione], et nos omnis plebs[16] quoniam ex fornicatione natus est [et maleficus est], et dicit se ipsum esse filium dei et regem, et non credis nobis?

---

[1] β μὴ ὀμν. ματ. [2] ὅτι ἁμ. ἐ.] cum B Latt. Copt. . . A C E I om.

[3] β adds κατὰ τῆς τύχης Καίσαρος.

[4] οὗτοι usque θανάτου agrees generally with B E I, A and Latt.; but all these sources except A add κατὰ τῆς σωτηρίας Καίσαρος after ὀμόσουσιν.

[5] οὐκ ἀποκ.] Arm. literally = *non habetis aliquid respondere?* All other sources add πρὸς ταῦτα.

[6] β adds πρὸς ταῦτα.

[7] οἱ δώδ. οὗ. πιστ.] cum B E C, item Codd. Lat. aliquot; most Latin and Greek sources add *quoniam non est natus ex fornicatione*, but Greek A and Latin C omit with *a*.

[8] β adds ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας. [9] ἡμεῖς] comp. Latin C.

[10] β om. κράζ. but γ has λέγομεν.

[11] γεγέννηται] Here B E C, item Codd. Latt. except C add καὶ γόης ἐστίν, and A adds καὶ ὅτι πλάνος ἐστί.

[12] β adds καὶ γόης ἐστίν.

[13] βασ. κ. υἱ. θ.] The other sources have υἱ. θ. καὶ βασ.

[14] β has υἱὸν θ. καὶ βασιλέα.

[15] καὶ οὐ πιστ. ἡ.] The other sources have καὶ οὐ πιστευόμεθα.

---

[16] γ adds *dicimus*.

(Καὶ)[1] ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος (ἅπαν)[2] τὸ πλῆθος ἐξελθεῖν ἐκτὸς τῶν[3] δώδεκα[4] καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκέλευσε χωρισθῆναι[5]. Λέγει (ὁ Πιλᾶτος)[6]· ποίῳ λόγῳ[7] θέλουσιν[8] ἀποκτεῖναι;

[9] Λέγουσιν[10]· ζῆλον ἔχουσιν, ὅτι ἐν σαββάτῳ θεραπεύει.

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος· περὶ καλῶν ἔργων[11] θέλουσιν[12] ἀποκτεῖναι[13];

(Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ναί)[14].

Iussit Pilatus multitudinem foris eiicere, absque duodecim [viris[15] qui dicebant quoniam non est natus ex fornicatione]; et Iesum iussit *sequestrare.*

Et dicit [eis]: *Propter quam iniuriam* volunt occidere [Iesum]?

Dicunt [Pilato]: Zelum habent, quoniam in sabbato curat.

Dicit Pilatus: [ergo] propter bona opera volunt occidere [eum]?

---

[1] β om. *καί*. [2] β om. *ἅπαν*.

[3] *δώδεκα*] All sources add *τῶν εἰπόντων ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας* except C which varies it thus *excepto XII viros qui veritatem dicebant.*

[4] β adds *ἀνδρῶν τῶν εἰπόντων ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας.*

[5] *καὶ τ. Ἰη. ἐκ. χ.*] So all sources except A.

[6] β *καὶ λέγ. αὐτοῖς* and om. *ὁ Πιλ.* [7] *π. λ.*] β *διὰ τί.*

[8] β adds *τὸν Ἰησοῦν.*

[9] *λέγουσιν*] A B I Copt. add *τῷ Πιλάτῳ*: C E Latt. *αὐτῷ.*

[10] β adds *τῷ Πιλάτῳ.*

[11] *περὶ κ. ἔργων*] The Arm. is equally compatible with *περὶ καλοῦ ἔργου* or *περὶ καλῶν ἔργων.*

[12] *θέλουσιν*] Greek and Latin add *αὐτόν.*

[13] β = *ergo propter bonum opus volunt occidere ipsum.*

[14] β om. *λέγ. αὐ. ναί* through homoiotel.

---

[15] γ om. viris.

Caput III.

([1] *Θυμοῦ πλησθεὶς* [2] [a]) ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τοῦ πραιτωρίου καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· μάρτυρα ἔχω τὸν ἥλιον ὅτι οὐδεμίαν ἁμαρτίαν εὑρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ [3] [a]. [a] Jno. 18. 28.

[b] Ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν τῷ Πιλάτῳ· εἰ μὴ ἦν κακοποιὸς [4] (ὁ ἄνθρωπος) [5] οὗτος, οὐκ ἂν παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν σοι [b]. [b] Jno. 18. 30.

[c] Λέγει [6] ὁ Πιλᾶτος· λάβετε [7] καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὑμέτεραν θρησκείαν [8] κρίνατε [c]. [c] Jno. 18. 31.

[d] Λέγουσιν [9] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· *οὐκ ἔστιν* [10] *ἡμῖν* [11] (*νόμος*) [12] ἀποκτεῖναί τινα [d]. [d] Jno. 18. 31.

Caput III.

Exit foras praetorium [Pilatus] et dicit eis: Testem habeo solem, quia nec unam culpam invenio [in homine isto].

Responderunt Iudaei et dicunt Pilato: Si non esset [hic] malefactor [13], non tradidissemus eum tibi.

Dicit [illis] Pilatus: Tollite [eum vos] et secundum *legem* vestram iudicate.

Dicunt [ei] Iudaei: *Nobis non est fas* interficere quemquam.

---

[1] *θυ. πλ.*] So Latin.

[2] *β* om. *θυ. πλ.* and tr. *ὁ Π.* after *πραιτωρίου*.

[3] *β* for *αὐτῷ* has *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ*.

[4] *β* has *εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακοποιός* and om. *ὁ ἄνθ.*

[5] *ὁ ἄνθ.*] Greek and Lat. om.

[6] *β* adds *αὐτοῖς* after *λέγει*.

[7] *β* adds *αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς* after *λάβετε*.

[8] *β τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν*.

[9] *β λέγουσιν αὐτῷ*.

[10] *β ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν*.

[11] The Arm. = 'it is not for us law to kill.' The Arm. Vulgate here = *nobis non est dignum* (ὅσιον).

[12] *β* om. *νόμος*.

---

[13] *γ* = *mortis reus*.

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος[1]· ὑμῖν εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς μὴ[2] ἀποκτεῖναι, καί[3] μοι εἶπεν;

[a] Jno. 18. 33. [a] **Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον Πιλᾶτος καὶ λέγει τῷ** Ἰησοῦ[4]· **σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων**[a];

[b] Jno. 18. 37. [b] **Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ** εἶπας **ὅτι βασιλεύς εἰμι, ἐγὼ δὲ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα** ἵνα ἀκούσωσιν **τῆς ἀληθείας**[b 5].

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γῆς οὐκ ἔστιν **ἀλήθεια.**

Dicit Pilatus [Iudaeis]: Vobis *non dixit* deus *occidere* [quemquam], mihi dixit?

[Iterum] ingressus est Pilatus praetorium, [vocavit Iesum secreto] et dicit ad *eum*: Tu es rex Iudaeorum.

Respondit Iesus, [et dicit Pilato: A temetipso (*or* ex te) dicis istud, an alius dixit tibi de me? Respondit Pilatus et dicit Iesu: Numquid et ego Iudaeus sum? Gens tua et pontifices tradiderunt te mihi. Quidnam factum est tibi?

Respondit Iesus et dicit: Si ex mundo hoc esset regnum meum, ministri mei hoc agerent ne traderer Iudaeis: nunc autem regnum meum non est hic.

Dicit ei Pilatus: si hoc huiusmodi sit, ergo tu rex es.

Respondit Iesus[6]:] Tu *dicis*, rex sum; sed ego *in istud quidem natus sum*, et propter illud veni, ut

---

1 *β* adds πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους after Πιλᾶτος.

2 *β* ὑμῖν οὐκ εἶπεν and om. μή.

3 *β* om. καί.

4 This text awkwardly combines the reading of C I Ven. Eins. with that of A B Fabr.; Tisch. reads: Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον ὁ Πιλᾶτος καὶ ἐφώνησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν κατ' ἰδίαν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ. The Greek and Latin sources show the utmost difference of reading, but all agree in giving κατ' ἰδίαν.

5 The Latin has *ut testimonium perhibeam veritati, et omnis qui est ex veritate audit meam vocem.* So A; but B C E I om. *ut testim. perh. ver.*

---

6 This long omission in *a* may be due to homoioteleuton.

Λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὅρα σὺ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πῶς κρίνεται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχόντων ἐξουσίαν [a] *ἐπὶ γῆς.*

[a] Jno. 19. 10.

Caput IV.

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· εἶπεν ὅτι ἐγὼ [b] **Καταλύω τὸν ναὸν** [c] **τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγείρω ὃς ἐν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη** [c].

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος· τίνα ναόν; λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ὃν ᾠκοδόμησεν ὁ Σολωμών.

[b] Jno. 2. 19, 20.
[c] Mat. 26. 61; Mar. 14. 58.

[omnis qui est ex veritate] *audiat vocem meam.* [Dicit [1] Pilatus: Quid est veritas? Dicit ei Iesus: Veritas de caelo est.] [2] Dicit [ei] Pilatus: In terris vero non est veritas? Dicit ei Iesus: Vide tu veritatem. Veritatem dico, quomodo iudicatur (*or* investigatur) ab iis qui habent potestatem in terra.

Caput IV.

[Et [3] relinquens Iesum intus praetorium, exivit ad Iudaeos et dicit eis: Ego nec unam culpam invenio in eo [4].]

Dicunt [ei] Iudaei: dixit quoniam *possum* templum istud *dissolvere,* et in triduo restituere [illud] quod in XL et VI annis aedificatum est; [ille dicit dissolvo hoc, et in triduo restituo]. Dicit [eis] Pilatus: Quale templum? Dicunt Iudaei: Quod Solomon aedificavit.

[Iterum dicit illis Pilatus: Innocens sum ego a sanguine hominis iusti istius. Vos noscite. Dicunt ad eum Iudaei: Sanguis eius in nos et in filios nostros.]

---

[1] γ adds *ei.*

[2] This omission in *a* is probably due to homoioteleuton.

[3] γ = *sed Pilatus rel.*

[4] These words omitted in *a* are retained in the Greek, Latin, and Coptic sources. Their omission in *a* cannot be due to homoioteleuton.

[a] Lu. 23. 14–16. [a] Προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Πιλᾶτος *τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ* τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς *καὶ τοὺς Λευίτας* εἶπεν αὐτοῖς *λαθραίως*· *μὴ οὕτως ποιήσατε· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν* ἄξιος θανάτου. Ἀλλ' *ἡ* κατηγορία[1] *ὑμῶν*[a] *περὶ θεραπείας ἐστιν καὶ περὶ βεβηλώσεως σαββάτου.*

[b] Jno. 19. 12–15. *Λέγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς τῷ Πιλάτῳ· Καίσαρα*[b] *ἐὰν βλασφημήσῃ τις, ἄξιός ἐστιν θανάτου ἢ μή;*

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος· ἄξιος ἐστίν.

(Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· οὗτος δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐβλασφήμησεν[2]*.)*

Ἐκέλευσε δὲ (ὁ ἡγεμὼν) ἐξελθεῖν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἔξω, καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγει (αὐτῷ)· τί ποιήσω σοι;

Λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὕτως ἐδόθη.

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος τῷ Ἰησοῦ· πῶς ἐδόθη;

[c] Lu. 16. 29. *Λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· (Μωσῆς καὶ) οἱ προφῆται*[c] *προεκήρυξαν περὶ θανάτου τούτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεώς μου.*

Advocans Pilatus seniores et principes sacerdotum et Levitas, et dicit eis secrete: Ne isto modo agite: *accusatio enim vestra non facit hominem dignum* mortis, sed calumnia vestra de curatione est et de violatione sabbati. Dicunt *seniores et sacerdotum principes et Levitae* Pilato: Caesarem si quis blasphemat dignus est morte anne? Dicit Pilatus: Dignus est [morte].

Tunc *iussit* Iudaeos foras exire [de praetorio], et advocans Iesum dixit: Quid faciam tibi? Dicit Iesus [Pilato]: Ita datum est. Dicit Pilatus ad Iesum: Quomodo datum est? Dicit Iesus: [Omnes] prophetae praeconizaverunt de hac morte et [de] resur-

---

1 The Arm. words here used in both Acts of Pilate and Lu. 23. 14 rather = *κακηγορία*.

2 The other sources retain these words omitted in *β*, and all except Greek B and most Latin MSS. add after Ἰουδαῖοι the words: *εἰς Καίσαρα ἐάν τις βλασφημήσῃ, ἄξιός ἐστιν θανάτου;*

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· τί πλέον τούτου ἢ μείζονα βλασφημίαν (θέλεις) ἀκοῦσαι [a]*; Λέγει (ὁ Πιλᾶτος)· εἰ οὗτος ὁ λόγος βλάσφημός ἐστιν,* [b] λάβετε αὐτὸν *καὶ ἀπαγάγετε εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν,* καὶ κατὰ τὴν *θρησκείαν* ὑμῶν κρίνατε (αὐτόν) [b].

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Πιλάτῳ· ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἡμῶν γεγραμμένον ἐστιν, ἐὰν ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπῳ ἁμαρτήσῃ, ἄξιός ἐστιν λαμβάνειν τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν [c]*, ὁ δὲ εἰς θεὸν βλασφημῶν λιθοβολίᾳ λιθοβοληθήσεται* [1].

Περιβλεψάμενος δὲ ὁ ἡγεμὼν εἰς τοὺς περιεστῶτας ὄχλους τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεωρεῖ πολλοὺς δακρύοντας [2]*, καὶ λέγει· Οὐ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος βούλεται τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτοῦ.*

[a] Cf. Mar. 14. 63–4 and Mat. 26. 65–6.
[b] Jno. 18. 31.
[c] 2 Cor. 11. 24.

rectione mea. Iudaei [autem] *recusaverunt*[3] [audientes. Dicit ei Pilatus]: Quid [est] amplior blasphemia [quam istud] audire? Dicit [autem] [Iudaeis]: Hic sermo blasphemia est, tollite eum et perducite ad synagogam vestram et *iudicate secundum legem* vestram. Dicunt Iudaei Pilato: In lege nostra scriptum est: Si homo in hominem pecca*verit*, dignus est *plagis* quadragenis una minus; qui vero in deum blasphemat, lapidibus lapidetur.

[Dicit eis Pilatus: Prendite eum vos et qua lege volueritis facite. Dicunt Pilato: Dignus est crucifigi.]

Intuitus vero *iudex in populum* qui circumstabant Iudaeos vidit plurimos [eorum] lacrimantes et dixit: Non omnis multitudo vult eum mori. [Dicunt ei principes sacerdotum: Ideo venimus tota multitudo unanima ut moriatur. Dicit ad eos Pilatus: Quare

---

[1] Section 4 of ch. iv is wholly absent from *a*. The other sources conflict very much with each other as to its text.

[2] Armenian *a* literally = *sed aspiciens praeses in multitudinem qui circa illum stabant Iudaei, et vidit quod multi flebant.*

---

[3] The Arm. = *παρήκουον* or *παρεσιώπησαν οἱ ἀκούοντες.*

[a] Mat. 26. 63. *Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ὅτι εἶπεν ἑαυτὸν* [a] *υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ βασιλέα.*

Caput V.

Νικόδημος ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος ἔστη ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πιλάτου καὶ λέγει· Ἀξιῶ, εὐσεβῆ, κέλευσον ἀκούειν ὀλίγους λόγους· λέγει Πιλᾶτος· εἰπέ. λέγει ὁ Νικόδημος· ἐγὼ εἶπον τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς λευίταις καὶ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος[1] *τῆς συναγωγῆς, ὅτι τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον; (ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος) πολλὰ σημεῖα ἐποίησεν*

[b] Acts 5. 38-9. *καὶ ἔνδοξα*[2]*, ἃ οὐδεὶς ποιεῖν δύναται.* [b] **ἄφετε** *αὐτὸν καὶ μή τι . . .*[3] *ποιεῖτε (αὐτῷ)·* **εἰ γὰρ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστι** *τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο ὃ ποιεῖ, σωθήσεται,* **εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων καταλυθήσεται**[b]. *Μωσῆς ἀποσταλεὶς (παρὰ θεοῦ) εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ἐποίησεν*

moriatur?][4] Dicunt Iudaei: Quia dixit se filium dei esse et regem [Iudaeorum].

Caput V.

Nicodemus vir Iudaeus stetit ante Pilatum et dixit: Rogo *maiestatem tuam*, iube *me dicere sermones paucos.* Dicit Pilatus: Dic. Dicit Nicodemus: Ego dixi senioribus et *principibus sacerdotum* et Levitis et omni multitudini istius synagogae: Quid quaeritis hominem? Multa signa fecit et gloriosa quae nemo [alius fecit nec] facere potest. Permittite eum neque aliquid malum facite: quia si ex deo sunt signa quae facit, salvabitur; si autem ex hominibus, dissolvetur[5]. [Quia et] Moyses missus[6] in Egyptum fecit signa

---

[1] So the Armenian reflecting the ungrammatical sentence of Greek B.

[2] The Armenian literally = 'glorified,' and seems to have had the sense of 'gloriosa' which is only found in Lat. D^{abc}.

[3] In *a* there is a litura here of three letters.

---

[4] This omission in *a* may be due to homoioteleuton.

[5] *γ* om. *si a. ex h. dis.*

[6] *γ* adds *a deo.*

σημεῖα πολλὰ ἃ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός, ποιῆσον ἔμπροσθεν Φαραὼ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου. καὶ ἦσαν ἐκεῖ θεράποντες Φαραὼ ὁ Ἰανῆς καὶ ὁ Ἰαμρῆς, καὶ ἐποίησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει Μωσῆς, οὐ πάντα· καὶ εἶχον αὐτοὺς οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὡς θεοὺς τὸν Ἰανῆν καὶ τὸν Ἰαμρῆν· ἐπειδὴ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίησαν οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκ θεοῦ, ἀπώλοντο, καὶ αὐτοὶ οἳ ἐπίστευσαν αὐτοῖς. καὶ νῦν ἄφετε τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἄξιος θανάτου.

Λέγουσιν τῷ Νικοδήμῳ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· σὺ μαθητὴς γέγονας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ποιεῖς.

Λέγει πρὸς αὐτοὺς Νικόδημος· Μὴ καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼν μαθητὴς γέγονεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ; οὐ καὶ ματαίως κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀξιώματος τούτου· ἦσαν δὲ ἐμβριμούμενοι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι κατὰ τοῦ Νικοδήμου καὶ ἔτριζον τοὺς ὀδόντας (κατ' αὐτοῦ).

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος· τί τρίζετε κατ' αὐτοῦ; ἀλήθειαν γὰρ ἠκούσατε;

multa, quae dixit illi deus fac, [inquit,] ante Pharaonem regem Egypti. Et erant ibi servi Pharaonis Ianes et Iamres, et fecerunt illi signa quae fecit Moyses, non omnia, et habuerunt eos Egyptii sicut deos, Ianem et Iamrem: et quoniam signa quae fecerunt non erant ex deo, [perierunt] *ipsi et* qui[1] crediderunt eis. Et nunc permittite hominem istum: non enim est dignus morte.

Dicunt *Iudaei Nicodemo*: Tu discipulus factus es [istius]. [Propter hoc] et verbis eius *adiuvas*. Dicit ad eos Nicodemus: Numquid et praeses discipulus factus est eius et verbum ipsius facit? numquid vane constituit istum Caesar[2] super necessitatem hanc? Fremebant vero Iudaei super Nicodemum et stridebant dentibus [suis]. Dicit [ad eos] Pilatus: Quid stridetis [dentibus] adversus eum, quia veritatem audistis?

---

[1] γ for *qui* reads *ipsi non*.

[2] γ adds *Tiberius*.

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῦ λάβῃς καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ.

Λέγει ὁ Νικόδημος· ἀμήν, λάβω καθὼς εἴπατε.

Caput VI.

Εἷς δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παραπηδήσας ἠξίουν τὸν ἡγεμόνα λόγον ἀκούειν. καὶ λέγει ὁ ἡγεμών· τί θέλεις εἰπεῖν; εἶπε. καὶ λέγει· ἐγὼ τριάκοντα ἔτη (ἐν τῷ ναῷ)
[a] Jno. 5. 3-5. *κατεκείμην*[a] *καὶ ἐν ὀδύνῃ πόνων ἦν· καὶ ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, πολλοὶ δαιμονιζόμενοι καὶ ποικίλαις νόσοις κατακειμένοι ἐθεραπεύθησαν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Νεανίσκοι τινες*
[b] Lu. 7. 14 *κατηλέησάν με καὶ ἐβάστασάν*[b] *με μετὰ τῆς κλίνης καὶ ἀπήγαγόν με πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ ἰδών με ὁ Ἰησοῦς*
[c] Jno. 5. 8. [d] Mar. 2. 11. *ἐσπλαγχνίσθη καὶ εἶπεν λόγῳ·* [c]**ἔγειρε, ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν**[d]

Dicunt Iudaei [Nicodemo]: Veritatem ipsius accipias et portionem eius. Dicit Nicodemus: Amen [fiat, fiat, secundum verbum vestrum] accipiam sicut dixistis.

Caput VI.

Alius quidam ex Iudaeis autem exsiliens rogabat praesidem *loqui* aliquid verbum[1]. Dicit praeses: *Dic quodcumque vis.* Dixit [vir ille]: Ego, triginta [et octo] annos in *lectulo* iacebam *in*[2] infirmitate [pessimi] doloris. Et *veniente* Iesu multi daemoniaci et [aegroti] qui in diversis infirmitatibus *iacebant*, curati sunt ab eo. Iuvenes quidam miserti sunt mei et portantes me in lectulo duxerunt *ante eum.* Et videns me Iesus misertus est et dixit verbo: Surge. Tolle lectulum tuum et ambula. [Babai!][3] Et

---

[1] γ = *verba dicere.* [2] γ = *et in.*

[3] **This exclamation is absent in all the other sources.**

σου καὶ περιπάτει [c]. καὶ παραχρῆμα ἰάθην. καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Πιλάτῳ· ἐρώτησον αὐτὸν ποίᾳ [a] ἡμέρᾳ ἐθεραπεύθη. καὶ λέγει ὁ θεραπευθείς· ἐν σαββάτῳ [a]. Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Πιλάτῳ· μὴ οὐχ οὕτως ἐδιδάξαμεν ὅτι ἐν σαββάτῳ θεραπεύει καὶ δαίμονας ἐκβάλλει.

Ἄλλος τις τῶν Ἰουδαίων παραπηδήσας [b] λέγει· [c] τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθην, καὶ φωνὴν (μόνην) ἤκουον καὶ πρόσωπον οὐκ ἔβλεπον· καὶ παριόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἔκραξα εἰς φωνὴν μεγάλην· Ἐλέησόν με [d] κύριε, [d] καὶ ἔθηκεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου [d] καὶ παραχρῆμα εἶδον τὸ φῶς [1].

Καὶ ἄλλος τις (τῶν Ἰουδαίων) παραπηδήσας λέγει· Λεπρὸς ἦν καὶ ἐκαθάρευσε με λόγῳ.

[a] Jno. 5. 9, 10.
[b] Mar. 10. 50.
[c] Mar. 10. 46–8 and Lu. 18. 35–9.
[d] Mar. 8. 25.

statim sanus factus sum, [et tuli lectulum meum et ambulavi] [2]. Dicunt Iudaei Pilato: Interroga eum in qua die curatus est. Dicitque curatus: Sabbato. Dicunt Iudaei Pilato: Nonne sic docuimus quia in sabbato curat et daemones expellit?

Et alius quidam ex Iudaeis exsiliens dixit: Caecus natus sum, vocem [3] audiebam, faciem autem non videbam. Et transeunte Iesu clamavi magna voce: Miserere mei, domine, [miserere mei]. Et posuit manum suam super oculos meos, et statim vidi lumen. Et alius quidam *exsiliens* dicit: [Gibberosus eram, et erexit me verbo. Alius quidam exiens dicit:] [4] Leprosus eram, et sanavit me verbo.

---

[1] The Arm. = 'I saw the light.' In Lu. 8. 43 we have ἀνέβλεψα as in the Greek A. P.

---

[2] Latin, Coptic, and Greek AC retain *et statim sanus factus sum*, which other Greek MSS. omit. But no sources except *a* omit the words bracketed.

[3] γ adds *solum*.

[4] This omission may be due to homoioteleuton. However γ confirms *a* in omitting these words.

Caput VII.

Καὶ γυνή τις, ᾗ ὄνομα ἦν Σηροινίκ[1], ἀπὸ μακρόθεν κράζουσα εἶπεν· **αἱμορροοῦσα**[a] ἤμην καὶ **ἡψάμην τοῦ κρασπέδου**[b] **τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ** καὶ κατεπαύσθη **ἡ πηγὴ**[c] **τοῦ αἵματος** (διὰ δώδεκα ἐτῶν). λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Νόμον ἔχομεν γυναῖκα ἀνδρὶ μὴ ἐλθεῖν εἰς μαρτυρίαν.

[a] Mat. 9. 20.
[b] Mat. 9. 20 and Lu. 8. 44.
[c] Mar. 5. 29.

Caput VIII.

Ἄλλοι τινες ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν ἔκραζον (λέγοντες)· Ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιός ἐστιν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσονται[d] αὐτῷ.

Λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· καὶ διατί οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν αὐτῷ; Λέγουσιν (τῷ Πιλάτῳ)· οὐκ οἴδαμεν. ἄλλοι εἶπον (τῷ Πιλάτῳ)· τὸν Λάζαρον[e] ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Ἔντρομος γενόμενος ὁ ἡγεμὼν λέγει πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ τί θέλετε ἐκχέειν αἷμα ἀθῷον[f];

[d] Lu. 10. 17, 20 and Paul Epp. passim.
[e] Jno. 12. 9.
[f] Mat. 27. 4.

Caput VII.

Et mulier quaedam nomine *Veronis* a longe clamavit dicens: Fluens sanguine eram [annis duodecim], tetigi fimbriam vestimenti eius, et quievit fluxus sanguinis [mei]. Dicunt Iudaei [Pilato]: [nos] Legem habemus mulierem homini non venire ad testimonium.

Caput VIII.

Alii quidam virorum ac mulierum clamabant: Homo iste iustus est, et daemonia subiiciuntur illi. Dicit *ad illos* Pilatus, Et quare magistri vestri non sunt subiecti ei? Dicunt: Nescimus. Alii dixerunt: Lazarum suscitavit [post quatriduum] de mortuis. Tremefactus praeses dicit ad omnem multitudinem Iudaeorum: Et quid vultis effundere sanguinem innocentem?

---

[1] The Greek has Βερνίκη, Latin Veronica.

Caput IX.

Προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Πιλᾶτος τὸν Νικόδημον καὶ τοὺς δώδεκα οἳ εἶπον ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας, λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί ποιοῦμεν, ὅτι στάσις γίνεται ἐν τῷ λαῷ; Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· οὐκ οἴδαμεν, αὐτοὶ ὄψονται [1] [a]. πάλιν ὁ Πιλᾶτος προσκαλεσάμενος ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος λέγει· οἶδα ὅτι συνήθειά [b] ἐστιν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν ἀζύμων ἕνα τινὰ ἀπολύειν. ἔχω τινὰ κατάδικον ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ ᾧ ὄνομά ἐστι Βαραββᾶς, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν κατενώπιον ὑμῶν στήκοντα (τὸν Ἰησοῦν) [c] ἐν ᾧ οὐδὲν ἁμάρτημα [2] εὑρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ [3] [c]. τίνα [d] ἀπολύσω; **λέγουσιν· [e] Βαραββᾶν. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· Τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν ὃς ὠνομάσθη Χριστός [e]; λέγουσιν· Σταυρωθήτω [f].** ἕτεροι δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων

[a] Mat. 27. 4 and 24.
[b] Jno. 18. 39.
[c] Jno. 19. 4.
[d] Mat. 27. 21, 22.
[e] Mat. 27. 17.
[f] Mat. 27. 23.

Caput IX.

Convocans Pilatus Nicodemum et duodecim [viros] qui dicebant quoniam non est natus ex fornicatione, dicit ad eos: Quid facimus, quoniam *seditio* fit in populo? Dicunt ei: Non noscimus; ipsi noscunt. Iterum Pilatus convocavit omnem multitudinem [Iudaeorum] et dicit: Scio quia consuetudo vestra est in die festo azymorum dimittere unum [e vinctis]. Habeo quemdam damnatum in carcere [homicidam] nomine Barabba, et eum qui ante vos stat, in quo et nulla culpa invenitur in eo. Quem [vultis ut] dimittam vobis? Dicunt: Barabbam. Dicit eis Pilatus: Quid ergo faciam Iesum qui nominatus est Christus? Dicunt: Crucifigatur. Aliique ex Iudaeis dic*ebant*:

---

[1] Arm. = 'they know.' The Arm. vulgate translated ὄψονται in the same way.

[2] The Arm. α has the word յայսոց (= of evil spirits) which must be a corruption of յանցանաց = 'of delinquencies.'

[3] The structure of this clause ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐν αὐτῷ has a Syriac ring. But such Syriacisms sometimes occur in Armenian versions certainly made from Greek originals.

[a] Jno. 19. 12. λέγουσιν· [a] οὐκ εἶ φίλος Καίσαρος [a], ὅτι εἶπεν ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ βασιλέα καὶ οὐ Καίσαρα.

Ἐθυμώθη ὁ Πιλᾶτος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ λέγει· ἀει- (στασιαστὸν τὸ ἔθνος ὑμῶν, καὶ) τοῖς εὐεργέταις ὑμῶν ἀντιλέγετε.

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Ποίοις εὐεργέταις· λέγει ὁ Πιλᾶτος· Ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἀπὸ σκληρᾶς δουλείας ἔσωσεν ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τὸ μάννα [b] ἐψώμισεν ὑμῖν καὶ ὀρτυγομήτραν ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν καὶ ἐκ πέτρας ὕδωρ ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν, καὶ νόμον ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσι παρωργίσατε (κύριον) τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν καὶ ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπολέσαι ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἐλιτάνευσεν Μωσῆς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν, καὶ νῦν καταγελᾶτε μου ὥσπερ ἐκείνου ὅτι βασιλέα μισῶ.

[b] Jno. 6. 31.

Ἀναστὰς ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος ἤθελεν ἐξελθεῖν. [c] ἔκραξαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες τῷ Πιλάτῳ· Ἡμεῖς βασιλέα τὸν Καίσαρα οἴδαμεν καὶ οὐ τὸν Ἰησοῦν [c]. καὶ γὰρ οἱ Μάγοι [d] ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν δῶρα ἤνεγκαν αὐτῷ ὡς βασιλεῖ,

[c] Jno. 19. 15.

[d] Mat. 2. 1.

Non es amicus Caesaris, quia dixit se filium dei esse et regem: [an forte vis hunc esse regem] [1] et non Caesarem.

Iratus est Pilatus in Iudaeos et dicit: *Semper contrarii estis* benefactoribus vestris. Dicunt Iudaei: *quibus* benefactoribus? Dicit Pilatus: Deus vester de dura servitute eripuit vos, et in eremo *cibavit* vos manna et *dedit vobis cibum* coturnicem, et *de scopulosa petra potavit vos*, et dedit vobis legem: et *super* haec omnia irritastis deum vestrum, [et quaesivistis vitulum sculptum.] Et voluit deus occidere vos: et deprecatus est Moyses pro vobis et non *mortui estis*. Et nunc *dicitis mihi* quia regem odi [ego].

Exsurgit Pilatus de tribunali et voluit exire. Clamaverunt Iudaei et dicunt Pilato: Nos Regem Caesarem scimus et non *Christum*. Nam et magi ab

[1] This omission in *a* may be due to homoioteleuton.

λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων[a], *σῶσον ἡμᾶς*[1]. καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἡρώδης *βασιλεὺς ὅτι ἐγεννήθη, ἐζήτησεν ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν. γνοὺς ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Ἰωσὴφ*[b] παρέλαβεν *αὐτὸν* καὶ *τὴν* μητέρα αὐτοῦ *καὶ ἔφυγεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον· καὶ ἀκούσας Ἡρώδης ἀπώλεσεν τοὺς παῖδας*[c] *τῶν Ἑβραίων τοὺς γεννηθέντας ἐν Βηθλεέμ. Ἀκούσας τοὺς λόγους τούτους παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐφοβήθη καὶ κατασιγήσας τοὺς ὄχλους οἳ ἔκραζον, λέγει αὐτοῖς· ὃν ἐζήτει Ἡρώδης; λέγουσιν, οὗτός ἐστιν. καὶ* [d]λαβὼν *ὁ Πιλᾶτος* ὕδωρ ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας *αὐτοῦ* ἀπέναντι *πάντων*[2] λέγων· *ἀθῷός* εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δικαίου τούτου· ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε. *πάλιν ἔκραζον λέγοντες·* τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ *ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ* τέκνα ἡμῶν[d].

[a] Mat. 2. 3.
[b] Mat. 2. 14.
[c] Mat. 2. 16.
[d] Mat. 27. 24, 25.

oriente munera obtulerunt ei, sicut regi dicentes: tu es rex Iudaeorum, salva nos. Et cum audisset Herodes [a magis quia] rex natus est, voluit occidere *eum.* Cognovit pater *eius* Ioseph et tulit eum et matrem eius, et fugit in Egyptum. *Tunc iratus* Herodes *iussit occidere* infantes Iudaeorum qui nati sunt in Bethleem, *et in omnibus finibus eius*[3].

Cum audisset *haec* [Pilatus] a Iudaeis extimens, imposuit silentium populo, qui clamabant, et dixit iis: [Quis] quem quaerebat Herodes? Dicunt [Iudaei]: [immo] iste est. Sumsit Pilatus aquam, lavit manus suas coram omnibus dicens: Innocens sum ego a sanguine iusti istius: vos noscitis. Iterum clamaverunt dicentes: Sanguis eius super nos et super filios nostros.

---

[1] This is an extra-canonical detail.

[2] The Coptic had *πάντων* 'coram omnibus': Greek A and Latt. have *τοῦ ὄχλου*: Greek B C *τοῦ ἡλίου*.

---

[3] γ reads instead of *Tunc iratus, &c.*, the following: *Tunc sine otio erat Herodes, advocante Augusto Caesare. Sed postquam reversus est post unum annum, jussit interfici infantes Bethlehem et finium eius secundum tempus veniendi mayorum.*

Τότε ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος καταπέτασμα ἑλκυσθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος οὗ ἐκαθέζετο. ἀπεφήνατο[1] οὕτως· τὸ ἔθνος σου λέγει[2] σε ὡς βασιλέα· διὰ τοῦτο ἐκέλευσα πρῶτον φραγελλοῦσθαι[a] διὰ τῶν θεσμῶν τῶν εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων[3], καὶ τότε ἀρτᾶσθαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐν τῷ κήπῳ[b] ὅπου ἐπιάσθη[c], καὶ Δημᾶς καὶ Γεστᾶς δύο κακοῦργοι[d] σὺν αὐτῷ[4].

CAPUT X.

(Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκ τοῦ πραιτωρίου καὶ οἱ δύο[e] λῃσταὶ[e] σὺν αὐτῷ·) ὅτε ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐξέδυσαν[f] τὰ ἱμάτια[f] αὐτοῦ (οἱ στρατιῶται) καὶ [g]ἐνέδυσαν αὐτῷ σινδόνιον λευκόν[g], καὶ [h]στέφανον ἀκανθινὸν ἔθηκαν ἐπὶ

[a] Mat. 27. 26 and Mar. 15. 15.
[b] Jno. 19. 41 and P. E. 24.
[c] Jno. 11. 57 and passim.
[d] Lu. 23. 32.
[e] Mat. 27. 38 and Mar. 15. 27.
[f] Mat. 27. 28.
[g] Lu. 23. 11.
[h] Mat. 27. 29.

Tunc Pilatus iussit velum protrahi ante tribunal ubi *sedebant*; sententiam protulit hoc modo: Gens tua di*xerunt* de te *propter regnum tui*: ideoque praecipio primum flagellari secundum *legem pii imperatoris*, et *deinde* in crucem *agant te.* [Tunc sumserunt eum et portaverunt] in hortum, ubi [etiam] *deprehensi sunt* Demas et Gestas duo malefactores una cum eo.

CAPUT X.

Quando venerunt ad locum, exspoliaverunt vestimenta eius et *praecinxerunt eum cinctura*, et coronam *de spinis* posuerunt super caput eius [et egerunt eum

---

[1] The Arm. = 'he gave a verdict' (ἀπόφασις).

[2] The Arm. = 'speak about thee as about a king.'

[3] The Coptic, Latin, and Greek all have the plural βασιλέων: β alone has the singular.

[4] The reading of α is echoed in the Coptic version: *Primum iubeo te flagellis caedi propter leges celsorum regum; deinde in crucem agi eo in loco ubi fuisti comprehensus, una cum Dema et Cysta duobus latronibus, qui tecum comprehensi sunt.* Tischendorf remarks of the Coptic: *male igitur interpres reddidit συσταυρωθ. σοι*, but the agreement of α suggests that we have here preserved an extra-canonical detail which has disappeared from the other sources. I know of no tradition which represents Jesus as having been crucified in the same garden in which he was taken, viz. Gethsemane.

κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ [h]. ὁμοίως καὶ τοὺς δύο κακούργους [a] ἐκρέμασαν [a], τὸν Δημᾶν ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ τὸν Γεστᾶν ἐξ εὐωνύμων [1]. [b] ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν· πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν· καὶ διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ [b] οἱ στρατιῶται. [c] καὶ ἵστατο ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐθεώρει· καὶ ἐνέπαιζον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες (σὺν αὐτοῖς ἅμα) λέγοντες· ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν. ἐνέπαιζον καὶ στρατιῶται, προσφέροντες αὐτῷ ὄξος καὶ χολήν [d], λέγοντες· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν. Ἐκέλευσεν δὲ ὁ Πιλᾶτος μετὰ τὴν ἀπόφασιν τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπιγραφῆναι εἰς τίτλον [e] Ἑλληνιστὶ καὶ Ῥωμαϊστὶ [2] καὶ Ἑβραιστί, καθὼς εἶπαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ὅτι βασιλεύς ἐστιν Ἰουδαίων.

[a] Lu. 23. 39.
[b] Lu. 23. 34.
[c] Lu. 23. 34 seq.
[d] Mat. 27. 34.
[e] Jno. 19. 20.

in crucem]. Similiter et duos malefactores suspenderunt, Demam a dextris et Gestam a sinistris. Iesus autem dicit: Pater, dimitte illis: non enim sciunt quid faciunt. Et diviserunt vestimenta eius milites. Et stabat populus et spectabat: et *contemnebant* eum, et principes sacerdotum et iudices [3] dicebant: Alios salvavit, salvet se ipsum; si filius dei est [electus]. Illudebant et iam milites offerentes ei acetum *mixtum cum* felle [4] dicentes: Si tu es rex Iudaeorum, libera temetipsum.

[Tunc] post *prolatam* sententiam Pilatus iussit scribi in titulo Graece et Dalmatice [5] et Hebraice, secundum quod dixerunt Iudaei: Rex est Iudaeorum.

---

[1] The words τὸν Δημᾶν . . . εὐωνύμων are excluded by Tischendorf from his Greek text, though the old Latin and Coptic versions have them. Also the Greek MS. A adds Δυσμᾶν ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ Στέγαν (Latt. Copt. Gestam) ἐξ εὐωνύμων. Other Greek MSS. omit or, like B, do not say which thief was on which hand.

[2] The Arm. = *Dalmatice*.

---

[3] Arm. = 'rulers.'

[4] In Mat. 27. 34 some texts read ὄξον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον.

[5] *Dalmatice* is the old Armenian rendering in the N. T. of *Latine*.

Εἷς τις τῶν κρεμασθέντων, ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν Γεστᾶς λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, σῶσον ἡμᾶς καὶ σεαυτόν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Δημᾶς ἐπετίμα λέγων τῷ ἑταίρῳ αὐτοῦ· οὐ φοβῇ σὺ τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι (καὶ ἡμεῖς) ἐσμέν· ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως ἃ ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν, καὶ ἐπιτιμήσας τῷ ἑταίρῳ αὐτοῦ λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ· μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, σήμερον[1] μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.

Caput XI.

Ὡς ἕκτη ὥρα ἦν σκότος ἔσχε (πᾶσαν)[2] τὴν γῆν ἕως ἐνάτης ὥρας· σκοτισθέντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου, ἐσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἀνὰ μέσον. καὶ ἐφώνησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ

Unus de suspensis nomine Gestas dicit ei: Si tu es Christus, libera *te et nos*. Respondit [socius cui nomen nuncupabatur] Demas et *dicit irate*: Non times tu deum, quia in eodem iudicio sumus? nos iuste[, nam digna] ea quae egimus recipimus; et increpuit socio suo, et dicit ad Iesum: Memento mei, [domine,] quum venis in regno tuo. Dicit *Iesus*: Amen dico tibi, hodie mecum eris in paradiso.

Caput XI.

Erat autem quasi sexta hora et tenebrae tenuerunt terram usque ad nonam horam. Obscurato autem sole, scissum est velum templi *in duas partes*. Clamavit Iesus voce magna et dixit: halach *phich droui*,

---

[1] In the later B form alone of the Greek Acts is *σήμερον* joined with *λέγω σοι*. To this form therefore must refer Professor A. Robinson's note on p. 375 of J. H. Hill's translation of the Arabic diatessaron.

[2] *πᾶσαν* is read in Greek A; *ὅλην* B; 'universam' in Lat. and Copt., but notice that all sources except the Armenian have *σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*. The Arm. *a* and *β* imply *σκότος εἶχε* (or *κατέσχε*) *τὴν γῆν*. Cp. the Pseudo-Petrine Gospel c. 15. Notice that although the A. P. throughout this passage follow Luke's Gospel, yet in regard to the eclipse they forsake him.

μεγάλῃ, καὶ λέγει· ἀλάχ, φιγὸ ῥοιν, ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται· (πάτερ)[1], εἰς χεῖρας σου παρατίθημι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος τὰ γενόμενα ἐδόξασεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων, ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ὁ παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, [ἐθεώρουν τὰ γενόμενα], ἔτυπτον τὰ στήθη ἑαυτῶν καὶ ὑπέστρεφον[a]. [a] Lu. 23. 48.

Ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος ἀνήνεγκεν τὰ γενόμενα τῷ ἡγεμόνι. ἀκούσας ὁ ἡγεμὼν καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα, καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγον οὐδὲ ἔπιον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. μεταπεμψάμενος ὁ Πιλᾶτος τοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἐθεωρήσατε τὰ γενόμενα· λέγουσιν αὐτοὶ τῷ ἡγεμόνι· ἔκλειψις ἡλίου[b] κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς γέγονε. [b] Lu. 23. 45.

[c] Εἱστήκεισαν πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, καὶ γυναῖκες αἳ ἐλθοῦσαι ἦσαν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἑωρῶν ταῦτα[c]. [c] Lu. 23. 49.

quod interpretatur in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum. Et haec locutus emisit spiritum. Videns quae facta sunt centurio glorificavit deum dicens: [Vere] homo hic *filius dei est*. Et omnis populus qui interfuerunt ad *videndum*, percutiebant pectora sua et revertebantur.

Centurio autem retulit quae facta sunt praesidi. Audivit praeses et mulier eius, et contristati sunt valde, non manducaverunt neque biberunt in *diebus illis*. Pilatus autem adducens Iudaeos ad sese dixit eis: Vidistis quodcunque factum est? Dicunt illi praesidi: Eclipsis solis secundum consuetudinem [suam] facta est.

Stabant omnes noti Iesu a longe et mulieres quae *secutae* fuerant a Galilea *videre* illud. Et vir quidam

---

[1] The Greek texts read πατήρ (or πάτερ) before and not after the Aramaic formula. In *a* it is placed more naturally after it.

[a] Lu. 23. 50–53. [b] Mat. 27. 59.

[a] καὶ (ἰδοὺ)[1] ἀνήρ τις, ὄνομα Ἰωσὴφ πολιτάρχης, ἀνὴρ δίκαιος καὶ ἀγαθουργός, οὗτος οὐ συγκατέθετο τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρίμαθεμ πόλεως καὶ ἔθνους Ἰουδαίων, καὶ προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ καθελὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐνετύλιξεν καθαρᾷ [b] σινδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐν λαξευτῷ μνημείῳ ἐν ᾧ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὐδέπω κείμενος [a].

Caput XII.

[c] P. E. 26.

Ἀκούσαντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ὅτι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ᾐτήσατο ὁ Ἰωσήφ, ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς δώδεκα τοὺς εἰπόντας ὅτι οὐ γεγέννηται ἐκ πορνείας καὶ τὸν Νικόδημον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἑταίρους οἵτινες ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πιλάτου τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐφανέρωσαν. πάντων δὲ ἀποκρυβέντων [c] μόνος ὁ Νικόδημος ὤφθη, ὅτι ἄρχων ἦν τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

cui nomen erat Ioseph, urbis princeps, vir iustus et benefactor, is non erat *adsentiens* consiliis et actibus illorum, *eratque e civitate Iudaeorum cui nomen erat Iarimathem, qui quidem* exspectabat regnum dei, is accessit ad Pilatum et petiit corpus Iesu. Et deponens de cruce involvit [in] munda sindone, et posuit eum in exsculpto monumento, in quo nullus fuerat positus.

Caput XII.

Audierunt Iudaei quia corpus Iesu petierat Ioseph, quaerebant eum et illos duodecim [viros] qui dicebant quia non est natus de fornicatione, et Nicodemum, et alios *socios* eius qui coram Pilato bona opera eius referebant. Omnibus iis latentibus, solus Nicodemus apparuit, quia princeps erat Iudaeorum, dicit Iudaeis:

---

[1] Greek B C, also Latin and Coptic retain *ἰδού*. Greek A omits.

Λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· πῶς εἰσήλθατε εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· σὺ πῶς ἦλθες εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν; ὅτι συνίστωρ αὐτοῦ ἦς, σὺν αὐτῷ τὸ μέρος σου ἐν τῷ (μέλλοντι) αἰῶνι[1].

Λέγει ὁ Νικόδημος· ἀμήν, (ἀμήν, ἀμήν). ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ὠφθεὶς λέγει· τί ἐλυπήθητε διότι ᾐτησάμην τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ; ἰδοὺ ἐν κοινῷ[a] *μνημείῳ*[a] *ἔθηκα αὐτόν, ἐντυλίξας ἐν καθαρᾷ σινδόνι*[b], *καὶ ὑμεῖς οὐ καλῶς ἐπράξατε κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου τούτου, ὅτι οὐ μετεμελήθητε τοῦ σταυρῶσαι αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγχῃ*[c] *ἐκεντήσατε αὐτόν*[2]. *Κρατήσαντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἐκέλευσαν ἀσφαλισθῆναι*[d] *αὐτόν. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· τοῦτο γίγνωσκε ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐκ ἀπαιτεῖ πρᾶξαί τι κατὰ σοῦ, ὅτι σάββατον*[e]

[a] Mat. 27. 60.
[b] Mat. 27. 59.
[c] Jno. 19. 34.
[d] Mat. 27. 64-6.
[e] Lu. 23. 54.

Quomodo ingressi estis synagogam? Dicunt ei Iudaei: Tu quomodo *ingressus es* synagogam, quia consentiens[3] illi eras? Cum illo pars tua in seculo. Dixit Nicodemus: Amen. Similiter et Ioseph apparuit, dicit: Quid contris*tati estis* [de me], quia petii corpus Iesu? Ecce in communi[4] monumento posui eum involvens in munda sindone, [et lapidem advolvi ad ostium speluncae]. Et vos non bene egistis de iusto illo; neque poenituit vobis a crucifigendo eum, sed lancea perculistis *latus eius.* [Tunc] tenuerunt Iudaei Ioseph et iusserunt custodiri et dicunt: *gratias age*; quia hora *non est exigere aliquid*, *quia* sabbatum

---

[1] All Greek and most Latin sources, also Coptic, read *τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετά σου ἐν τ. μ. αἰ.* Two Latin MSS. alone, A and B, exhibit the Armenian reading: *Portio tua sit cum illo, &c.* *μέλλοντι* is read in all sources except *β*.

[2] *ἐκεντήσατε αὐτόν*] *β* literally = *perculistis latera eius.*

---

[3] Arm. = *eadem narrans.*

[4] = *κοινῷ*, a misreading of *καινῷ*, which proves this translation to have been made from Greek.

διαφαύει. (ἔτι δὲ ἀκριβῶς) γίνωσκε[1] ὅτι καὶ ταφῆς ἄξιος οὐκ εἶ, ἀλλὰ δίδομεν τὸ σῶμά σου τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰωσήφ· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι τοῦ ὑπερηφάνου Γολιὰδ εἰσίν, ὃς ὠνείδισεν θεὸν ζῶντα καὶ τὸν ἅγιον Δαυίδ. εἶπεν ὁ θεός· **ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, κἀγὼ ἀνταποδώσω**[a]. οὗτος δὲ ὁ ἀκρόβυστος[2] τῇ σαρκὶ καὶ περιτεμνόμενος[b] τῇ καρδίᾳ [c] **λαβὼν ὕδωρ ἀπενίψατο** κατέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου (λέγων)· ἀθῷός **εἰμι ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δικαίου** τούτου· ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε· καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀπεκρίθητε (τῷ Πιλάτῳ), λέγοντες· **τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ** ἐφ' **ἡμᾶς** καὶ ἐπὶ **τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν**[c]. καὶ νῦν φοβοῦμαι μήποτε **φθάσει ἡ ὀργὴ**[d] (κυρίου)[3] ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν.

Ἀκούσαντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τοὺς λόγους τούτους[4] ἐπι-

[a] Ro. 12. 19 and He. 10. 30.
[b] Ro. 2. 29 and Deut. 10. 16 and 30. 6.
[c] Mat. 27. 24.
[d] 1 Th. 2. 16.

illucesc*ebat.* Cognosce quia nec sepultura *olim eras dignus* sed dab*amus* carnem tuam volatilibus coeli et bestiis *terrae.* Dicit eis Ioseph: Iste sermo Goliad superbi est, qui exprobravit deo vivo et sancto David. Dixit deus [per prophetam]: Mihi vindicta et ego retribuam, [dicit dominus]. Hic non circumcisus carne, sed circumcisus corde accipiens aquam lavit ante solem: Innocens sum ego, dicit, a sanguine iusti [istius]; vos cognoscitis. Et vos respondistis dicentes: Sanguis istius super nos et super filios nostros. Et nunc timeo ne quando adveniat vobis ira et in filios vestros [sicut vos dixistis]. *Audientes autem* Iudaei verba haec amariciti sunt animis suis;

---

[1] *τοῦτο γίγν. κ.τ.λ.*] *β* = 'be thankful that 'tis not the hour to exact aught,' as if the Greek were *εὐχαρίστει ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπαιτεῖν*, and omits *πρᾶξαί τι κατὰ σοῦ.* Of that reading as of *ἔτι δὲ ἀκριβῶς* in *a* I find no echo in other sources.

[2] The phrase in the text must be derived from the apocryph of Jeremiah cited by Gregory of Nyssa (p. 313, ed. Zacagni): *περιτέμνεσθε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν καὶ μὴ τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας ὑμῶν.* Vide Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte,* Leipsic, 1894, p. 375.

[3] *Κυρίου* is in all Greek sources. Coptic and Latin have Dei.

[4] After *τούτους* three or four letters are erased in *a*.

κράνθησαν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἑαυτῶν, καὶ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἐνέκλεισαν εἰς οἶκον ὅπου οὐκ ἦν θυρίς. καὶ παραφύλακες παρέμειναν[1] τῇ θύρᾳ· καὶ ἐσφράγισαν[a] τὴν θύραν ὅπου ἐνέκλεισαν Ἰωσήφ.

[a] Mat. 27. 66.

Τῷ δὲ σαββάτῳ ὅρον ὥρισαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευῖται ὥστε πάντας εὑρεθῆναι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ· ἐβουλεύοντο ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν. καθεσθέντος δὲ τοῦ συνεδρίου ἐκέλευσαν ἀχθῆναι αὐτὸν μετὰ πολλῆς ἀτιμίας· καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν θύραν οὐδένα εὗρον[b] αὐτοῦ ('illic'). καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἔκθαμβοι[c] ἐγένοντο ὅτι τὰς σφραγῖδας εὗρον σῴας[2] καὶ τὴν κλεῖδαν εἶχεν ὁ Καϊάφας· καὶ οὐκ ἔτι ἐτόλμησαν ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας (αὐτῶν), οἳ ἐλάλησαν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πιλάτου περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

[b] Lu. 24. 3.
[c] Mar. 16. 5.

[deinde] incluserunt *eum in claustro ubi non erat* fenestra, et custodes posuerunt ad ianuas, et signaverunt ianuam ubi *erat* inclu*sus* Ioseph.

Sabbato autem tempus definitum fecerunt *synagogae principes et Levitae* ut omnes *congregarentur in synagogam* [in prima sabbatorum. Et vigilantes diluculo omnis multitudo in synagoga] consiliati sunt quali morte interficerent eum. Sedente autem congregatione iusserunt duci eum cum *magna* iniuria: et aperientes ianuam neminem invenerunt. Inhiaverunt omnes populi, et extimuerunt quia signacula inve*nerunt* signata, [et custodes stabant ad portam,] et *clavem habuit* Caiphas. Et amplius non ausi sunt mittere manum *in eos* qui locuti sunt ante Pilatum de Iesu.

---

[1] Lit. *appositi sunt.*
[2] A alone of the other sources shows this reading.

Caput XIII.

Ἔτι δὲ αὐτῶν συναχθέντων καὶ θαυμαζόντων διὰ τὸν Ἰωσήφ, [a] ἦλθόν τινες τῆς κουστωδίας, οὓς ἐπεστήσαντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παρὰ τοῦ Πιλάτου τηρεῖν [b] τὸ σῶμα. καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν τοῖς ἀρχισυναγώγοις καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ πάντι τῷ ὄχλῳ τὰ γενόμενα· τὸ πῶς ἐγένετο [a] [c] σεισμὸς (μέγας) [1], καὶ εἴδομεν [d] ὅτι ἄγγελος τοῦ κυρίου κατέβη ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον [c]· ἀνέστη (γὰρ θαυμαστὸς (or -τῇ) ἐν δόξῃ [e] καὶ ἐλάλει ταῖς γυναιξὶν ὁ κύριος) [2].

[a] Mat. 28. 11.
[b] Mat. 28. 4.
[c] Mat. 28. 2.
[d] Mar. 16. 5.
[e] 1 Cor. 15. 43.

Caput XIII.

Et dum illi congregati erant atque mirabantur de Ioseph venerunt quidam de custodibus, quos statu*erant* Iudaei a Pilato custodire *sepulcrum Iesu*, [ne venientes discipuli eius furentur eum]. Annuntiaverunt *sacerdotum principibus et senioribus synagogae quaecunque facta sunt*, [responderunt principes sacerdotum et dicunt :] quomodo factus est terrae motus. [Aiunt dum custodiebamus nos] vidimus angelum domini descend*entem* de coelo et revolvit lapidem [ab ostio sepulcri] ; [et erat adspectus eius sicut fulgur et vestimentum eius album sicut nix. Et prae timore eius facti sumus velut mortui. Et audivimus vocem angeli loquentis mulieribus, quae stabant ad sepulcrum Iesu quia: Ne timete; Iesum crucifixum quaeritis: non est hic,] surrexit [autem sicut dixit; venite et videte locum ubi posuerunt eum. Et euntes dicite discipulis, quia iam praecedit vos in Galilaeam, ibique videte eum. Ecce dixi vobis].

---

[1] Some Latin editions read *terrae motus* only, omitting *magnus* which Latin MSS. add.

[2] Here *β* adds much that agrees generally with Matt. 28. 1-6. The text of *a* is found in no other source. In the canonical texts it is one or two angels who converse with the women about the risen Lord. Christ himself does not appear or speak. In the P. E. alone Christ appears, but does not speak. The

Λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ποίαις γυναιξὶν ἐλάλει........ λέγουσιν· οἴδαμεν ποῖαι ἦσαν. λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ποία ὥρα ἦν; λέγουσιν οἱ τῆς κουστωδίας[1]· μέσης νυκτός[a]. λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· διὰ τί οὐκ ἐκρατήσατε τὰς γυναῖκας; λέγουσιν οἱ τῆς κουστωδίας· [b]ὡς νεκροὶ ἐγενόμεθα[b] ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου, μὴ ἐλπίζοντες ἰδεῖν τὸ φῶς τῆς ἡμέρας· (πῶς εἴχομεν[2] αὐτάς;) λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ζῇ κύριος, (ὅτι) οὐ πιστεύομεν ὑμῖν. λέγουσιν οἱ τῆς κουστωδίας· τοσαῦτα σημεῖα εἴδετε εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε· ἡμῖν πῶς πιστεύετε; καὶ γὰρ καλῶς ὠμόσατε ὅτι ζῇ κύριος. πάλιν λέγουσιν οἱ τῆς κουστωδίας· ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τὸν αἰτησάμενον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐνεκλείσατε αὐτὸν ἐν οἴκῳ τινὶ καὶ τὴν θύραν

[a] P. E. 36.
[b] Mat. 28. 4.

Dicunt Iudaei [custodibus]: Quibus mulieribus loquebatur? Dicunt: *nescimus* quae erant. Dicunt Iudaei: et quae hora fuit? Dicunt custodes: *Media* nocte. Dicunt Iudaei: Quare non tenuistis *eas*? Dicunt custodes: Tanquam mortui facti sumus a timore, non sperabamus videre lumen diei: Dicunt Iudaei: Vivit dominus, non credimus vobis. Dicunt custodes: Tanta signa vidistis *in homine illo* et non credidistis [illi]: nobis quomodo crederetis? *Istud autem* bene *iurastis quia* vivit dominus. Iterum dicunt custodes [Iudaeis]: Audivimus [nos] quia qui petiit corpus Iesu, inclusistis eum in domum unam et

---

statement here in *a* that the Lord spoke with the women is consistent with the omission of Mat. 28. 5, 6, of which *β* gives the substance, and also with the obliteration in *a* of a word immediately below after ποίαις γυναιξὶν ἐλάλει. The word erased may have answered to ὁ Κύριος or ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Perhaps the original text of the A. P. has been here mutilated, as giving extra-canonical details. Yet this is doubtful, for below in xiii. 2 the guards say: ὁ Ἰησοῦς καθὼς ἠκούσαμεν τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἀνέστη καὶ ἔστιν ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ (cp. Mat. 28. 5–7).

[1] Here and elsewhere the Arm. is equivalent simply to 'milites.'

[2] Perhaps we should render the Armenian πῶς ἐκρατοῦμεν αὐτάς, but since πῶς εἴχομεν κρατῆσαι αὐτάς is read in Coptic and other sources, it is more probable that κρατῆσαι has dropped out of the text of *a*.

ἠσφαλίσατε καὶ ἐσφραγίσατε καὶ ὡς ἠνοίξατε, οὐχ εὕρατε αὐτόν. δότε οὖν ὑμεῖς τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ ἡμεῖς δίδομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τοῖς ἐκ κουστωδίας· ἡμεῖς δίδομεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ ὑμεῖς δότε τὸν Ἰησοῦν. λέγουσιν οἱ τῆς κουστωδίας· πρῶτον ὑμεῖς δότε τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ εἶθ' ἡμεῖς δίδομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. λέγουσιν (τοῖς τῆς κουστωδίας)[1]· ὁ Ἰωσὴφ εἰς πόλιν αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν. λέγουσιν οἱ τῆς κουστωδίας (πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους)[2]. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καθὼς ἠκούσαμεν τοῦ ἀγγέλου, ἀνέστη[a], καὶ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.

Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἐφοβήθησαν[b] σφόδρα[c], λέγοντες· [d]μήποτε[e] ἀκουσθῇ ὁ λόγος οὗτος καὶ πάντες ἐξομολογήσωνται εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν[d]. καὶ συμβούλιον[f] ποιήσαντες ἀλλήλοις, (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) ἀργύρια

[a] P. E. 30 and 56.
[b] Lu. 22. 2 and P. E. 28.
[c] Mat. 28. 11.
[d] P.E. 48.
[e] P.E. 30.
[f] Mat. 28. 12.

portam clusistis et signastis [anulo], et quum aperuistis [portam] non invenistis eum. Date ergo vos Ioseph, et nos damus Iesum. Dicunt Iudaei custodibus: nos damus Ioseph, vos date Iesum. Dicunt custodes [Iudaeis]: Primo vos date Ioseph, et nos damus Iesum. Dicunt *Iudaei*: Ioseph civitatem suam ivit [Arimathem]. Dicunt custodes: Et Iesus, quemadmodum audivimus ab angelo [qui saxum revolvit, quia] *praecedat vos* in Galilaea.

Quum audirent Iudaei sermones hos, timuerunt valde, dicentes: Ne quando *audiatur* sermo iste et omnes declinent in Iesum. Et consilium faci*entes una cum senioribus* argentum multum dederunt militibus, dicentes: [Dicite quia nobis dormientibus venerunt discipuli eius et furati sunt eum. Et si auditum fuerit a praeside, nos satisfaciemus ei et vos

---

[1] For τοῖς τ. κ. the Greek MS. A has τοῖς ὑπηρέταις. Other Greek sources omit. So also Coptic. The Lat. MSS. A C add 'custodibus.'

[2] Some Greek sources omit πρὸς τ. 'I., also the Latin B C and Coptic. Others retain.

ἱκανὰ [a] ἔδωκαν τοῖς στρατιώταις λέγοντες ἵνα μὴ δηλώσωσιν[1].

Caput XIV.

Φίλεός τις ἱερεὺς καὶ Ἀδδᾶς διδάσκαλος καὶ Ἐγίας λευίτης κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐξηγήσαντο τῇ συναγωγῇ (καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν) ὅτι εἶδον τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς ἕνδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καθεζομένους ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Μαμβρήχ, καὶ ἔλεγεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. [a] πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον κηρύξατε πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει· καὶ ὁ πιστεύσας (καὶ βαπτισθεὶς)[2] σωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ὀλιγοπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται. (σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασιν παρακολουθήσουσιν, τουτέστι· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν, ἐν γλώσσαις λαλήσουσιν, κἄνπερ θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ βλάψει αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους

[a] Mar. 16. 15–19.

securos faciemus. Illi vero accipientes argentum, fecerunt sic ut didicerunt: et exiit rumor iste e Iudaeis usque hodie].

Caput XIV.

Philemôn sacerdos et Adas doctor et Egias Levita, descenderunt de Galilaea in Ierusalem et retulerunt *archisynagogis*, quoniam viderunt Iesum et undecim discipulos eius, quoniam sede*bat* in monte, cui nomen erat *Sambrelech*, et dicebat discipulis suis: Ite in mundum *confessionis, et hoc quod vidistis annuntiate.*

---

[1] α while here omitting much that is given in β and in all the other sources, is yet consistent with itself and shows no sign of having been mutilated. Indeed that such is not the case is proved by the kindred omission in α xiv. 3. Here then α seems to present a text which goes back beyond every other source, including the Coptic. Such matter is more likely to have been added by β than really omitted by α.

[2] On this passage see introduction. The passage σημεῖα . . . ἕξει αὐτοῖς is omitted in the Latin sources E Eins. Fabr. Cors. In the Latin editions D^{abc} and ed^{pr} they are absent. The Greek A omits in this passage Mar. 16. 16 and paraphrases Mar. 16. 17, 18 thus: ὅτι οἱ πιστοὶ πολλὰ σημεῖα ποιήσουσι καὶ πολλοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἰάσονται. The Coptic retains the entire passage.

χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἕξει αὐτοῖς). καὶ ἔτι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, εἴδομεν αὐτὸν ἀναληφθέντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

Λέγουσιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ λευῖται· δότε τὴν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ δότε αὐτῷ ἐξομολόγησιν, ταῦτα (ἅπερ ἐξηγήσασθε) ἠκούσατε καὶ ἴδετε; λέγουσιν αὐτοῖς οἱ ἐξηγησάμενοι· ζῇ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὅτι τοῦτο ἠκούσαμεν αὐτὸν ἀναληφθέντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· εἰς τοῦτο ἤλθατε οἱ ἐξηγησάμενοι ἡμῖν, ἢ ἤλθατε εὐχὴν ἀποδοῦναι τῷ θεῷ; λέγουσιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ λευῖται πρὸς αὐτούς· εἰ (εὐχὴν) ηὔξασθε ἀποδοῦναι τῷ θεῷ, εἰς τί ἐστιν ἡ φλυαρία αὕτη ἣν ἐφλυαρήσατε ἀπέναντι πάντος τοῦ λαοῦ[a]; λέγει Φίλεος ἱερεὺς καὶ Ἀδδᾶς διδάσκαλος καὶ Ἐγίας λευίτης πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχισυναγώγους· εἰ οἱ λόγοι

[a] Mat. 27. 64.

Et *qui credunt salvi erunt*[1]; qui vero *non credunt*, condemnabuntur. Et dum Iesus [hoc] loquebatur ad discipulos, vidimus eum *elevatum* in coelum.

Dicunt autem sacerdotum principes et *scribae*: Date gloriam deo Israel, et date confessionem ei, [quia] ista [accurate] *vidistis et audistis*. Dicunt *viri*: Vivit [dominus] deus patrum nostrorum, deus Abraam et Isaac et Iacob, quia hoc audivimus *ab eodem* [et vidimus] quod ascendit in caelum. Dicunt *sacerdotum principes*: Ad hoc venistis *nuntiare* nobis, an venistis *proferre preces vestras*? [Dicunt ei viri: Venimus proferre vota nostra.] Dicunt seniores et principes sacerdotum et Levitae *cum* iis: si votum venistis[2] perficere deo, cur deliramentum istud quod *iterastis* ante omnem populum? Dicit *Ambelianus sacerdotum princeps* et Adas didascalus et Egias Levita

[1] Arm. = 'shall live,' the common equivalent of 'shall be saved.'

[2] The Arm. = *si vovistis*, but there must be a corruption in the text.

οὗτοι οὓς ἐλαλήσαμεν καὶ ἠκούσαμεν ἁμαρτία εἰσιν, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἐσμέν. ὃ ἂν ἀγαθὸν ᾖ ποιήσατε. οἱ δὲ λαβόντες τὸν νόμον ὥρκισαν αὐτοὺς μηδενὶ ἐξηγήσασθαι τοὺς λόγους τούτους. ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν, (καὶ ἐξέβαλαν αὐτοὺς ἔξω τῆς πόλεως)[1], καὶ (ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς) ἀργύρια καὶ ἄνδρας τρεῖς μετ' αὐτῶν, (καὶ ἤγαγον[2] αὐτοὺς) ἕως τῆς Γαλιλαίας. καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

Συμβούλιον δὲ ἐποίησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, (πορευθέντων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ)[3]. ἀπέκλεισαν ἑαυτοὺς οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ [a] ἐκόπτοντο κοπετὸν μέγαν λέγοντες· ὅτι τί σημεῖον γέγονεν τοῦτο [a] ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ; λέγει Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας· τί περίλυποι αἱ ψυχαὶ ἡμῶν; τοῖς στρατιώταις

[a] P.E. 28.

ad archisynagogas: Si verba ista quae locuti sumus, et audivimus [et vidimus], peccata sunt, ecce ante vos stamus: quodcunque *placet vobis* facite [nobis]. At illi accipientes *librum legum* adiuraverunt eos nulli narrare verba ista. Et dederunt eis manducare et bibere et argentum et viros tres, *duces vadendi iis* in Galilaeam, et vadebant in pace.

Consilium fecerunt Iudaei inter se, et concluserunt sese archisynagogae et sacerdotes in synagoga, plangebant planctum magnum et dicebant: Quid signum contigit hoc in Israel? Dicunt Annas et Caiphas: Quid tristes sunt animae vestrae? militibus ha-

---

[1] All Greek sources retain these words, also nearly all Latin sources. The same is true of the next two omissions.

[2] The Arm. answers to the word used here in the Latin version, *perduxerunt*, rather than to ἀποκατέστησαν of the Greek.

[3] These words omitted in β precede συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν in all the Greek MSS. except C, whose order alone tallies with that of *a*. No Greek sources omit them. Most Latin sources have the same order as *a*, but the Latin D[abc] and ed[pr] omit from πορευθέντων to καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς. Perhaps β, as rejecting a clause of which the position varies in other sources should be reckoned to here represent the older text.

[a] Mat. 28. 2. ἔχομεν πιστεῦσαι, ὅτι [a] ἄγγελος κυρίου ἦλθε καὶ ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον [a]. ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὅσιον πιστεῦσαι ἀκροβύστοις, ὅτι καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἔλαβον χρυσίον
[b] Mat. 28. 15. ἱκανὸν καὶ καθὼς ἐδιδάξαμεν [b], οὕτως εἶπαν.

Caput XV.

[c] Mar. 14. 60. Ἀνέστη ὁ Νικόδημος [c] ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ συνεδρίου ('fori') λέγων· ἀγνοεῖτε [1], λαὸς (κυρίου) [2], τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐλθόντας ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας; ὅτι αὐτοί εἰσιν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, ἄνδρες εὔποροι, μισοῦντες τὴν ἀναιδείαν, ἄνδρες
[d] Mat. 28. 16. εἰρήνης. αὐτοὶ ἐξηγήσαντο μετὰ ὅρκου ὅτι εἴδαμεν [d] τὸν

bemus [3] credere quia angelus domini *descendit de caelo* et lapidem revolvit [ab monumento]? [Unde vero cognoscimus quia discipuli eius dederunt aurum multum custodibus sepulcri et tulerunt corpus Iesu docueruntque eos ita dicere:] Num nescitis quia non licet [4] credere non circumcisis aliquod verbum, quia etiam a nobis acceperunt *argentum* multum, et sicut docuimus [eos] ita dixerunt?

Caput XV.

Exsurgens Nicodemus in medio concilio ait [illis]: [Recte dixistis quodcunque dixistis. Omnis] populus *cognoscunt* viros [istos] qui venerunt de Galilaea quia illi sunt timentes dominum, viri *pacifici qui* oderunt insolentiam [et avaritiam]? ipsi narraverunt cum

---

[1] The Arm. α = *non noscite.* The Greek text and Coptic have: ὀρθῶς λαλεῖτε, οὐκ ἀγνοεῖτε. The Latin texts omit οὐκ ἀγνοεῖτε. Text β = ὀρθῶς εἴπατε, ὅπερ εἴπατε, ἅπας ὁ λαὸς γιγνώσκουσι τοὺς ἄνδρας. Thus α keeps what the Latin texts reject; they reject what it retains; while β has a reading of its own.

[2] Latin and Coptic omit λαὸς κυρίου.

---

[3] The literal translation in α and β of the Greek phrase ἔχομεν, given in Greek B C, proves that the Armenian version was made from Greek. The old Latin has *debemus.*

[4] γ = *fas est*

Ἰησοῦν καθεζόμενον εἰς τὸ ὄρος Μαμβρῆχ μετὰ τῶν ἕνδεκα μαθητῶν [d] αὐτοῦ, ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῖς ὅσα ἠκούσατε παρ' αὐτῶν καὶ εἶδον αὐτὸν ἀναληφθέντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἠρώτησεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ποίῳ σχήματι ἀνελήφθη. καὶ καθὼς διδάσκει ἡμᾶς τὸ ἅγιον βιβλίον ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἡλίας ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ Ἐλισσαῖος ἐφώνησεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, καὶ ἔρριψεν Ἡλίας τὴν μηλωτὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπάνω τοῦ Ἐλισσαίου, καὶ ἔρριψεν Ἐλισσαῖος τὴν μηλωτὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπάνω τοῦ Ἐλισσαίου. καὶ ἔρριψεν ὁ Ἐλισσαῖος τὴν μηλωτὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπάνω τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ ἐπέρασεν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ἰεριχώ. καὶ ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ τὰ τέκνα τῶν προφητῶν καὶ εἶπαν (Ἐλισσαίῳ), ποῦ ὁ κύριός σου (Ἡλίας); καὶ εἶπεν (Ἐλισσαῖος), ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς Ἐλισσαῖον· μὴ πνεῦμά τι ἥρπασεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔρριψεν (αὐτὸν) ἐν ὄρεσί που; ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον λάβωμεν μεθ' ἡμῶν τοὺς παῖδας ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπελθόντες ζητήσωμεν. καὶ ἀπέκλεισαν τὸν Ἐλισσαῖον, κἀκεῖνος οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐξήτησαν αὐτὸν

sacramento, vidimus [ait] Iesum sedentem in monte Sambrelech cum undecim discipulis suis, quia docebat eos quod audiv*imus* ab iisdem et vid*imus* eum *elevatum* in caelum. Et quod nullus interrogavit eos, quomodo ascendit. Docet enim nos scriptura sacra *de Elia quod elevatus est in caelum: et clamabat Elisaeus voce magna*, et proiecit melotem super *eum*: et Elisaeus [accipiens] melotem Eliae, *perculit* Iordanem, et transiit [in sicca] et venit Iericho. Et occurrerunt ei filii prophetarum et dicunt: Ubi est dominus tuus? Et dicit, ascendit in caelum. Et dicunt ad Elisaeum: Numquid spiritus aliquis rapuit eum et proiecit in montibus alicubi? sed magis tollamus nobiscum pueros nostros et eamus requiramus [eum]. Et incluserunt illoco Elisaeum, et ille non ibat cum illis: et [illi] quaesierunt eum tribus diebus, et non invene-

[a] Lu. 24. 3.

τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ οὐχ εὗρον [a], καὶ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἀνελήφθη. Ἀλλ' ἀκούσατέ μου, καὶ ἀποστείλωμεν ἐν παντὶ ὄρει Ἰσραήλ, (καὶ ἴδωμεν) μήπως ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων ἡρπάσται καὶ ῥέριπται ἐν ὄρεσί που. καὶ ἤρεσεν πᾶσιν ὁ λόγος οὗτος. καὶ ἀπέστειλαν εἰς πάντα τὰ ὄρεα Ἰσραὴλ ζητῆσαι (αὐτόν. ἐζήτησαν) [1] τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ οὐχ εὗρον· τὸν δὲ Ἰωσὴφ εὕρομεν ἐν Ἀριμαθέμ [2].

Ἀκούσαντες περὶ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἐχάρησαν καὶ ἔδωκαν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ (Ἰσραήλ) [3]. καὶ συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ποίῳ τρόπῳ συντύχωσιν τῷ Ἰωσήφ. καὶ ἔλαβον τόμον χάρτου καὶ ἔγραψαν οὕτως.

runt et intellexerunt quod vere ascendit. *Et nunc*, audite me, et mittemus in omnes *fines* Israelis, ne raptus a spiritibus sit Iesus et *proiectus sit* in montibus alicubi. Et placuit *sermo coram omnibus*. Et miserunt in omnibus montibus Israel quaerere *Iesum*, et non invenerunt; Ioseph autem inven*erunt* in Arimathem, [neque ausi sunt comprehendere eum.

Et venientes annuntiaverunt senioribus et sacerdotum principibus et Levitis quia non invenimus Iesum: Ioseph autem invenimus in Arimathem.] Audientes autem de Ioseph gavisi sunt et dederunt gloriam deo. *Deinde* consilium fecerunt *principes sacerdotum et scribae et Levitae*, quomodo *possent videre* Ioseph. Et acceperunt tom*o* chartas et scripserunt [ad Ioseph] hoc modo.

---

[1] The reading *τοῦ ζητῆσαι αὐτὸν καὶ οὐχ εὗρον* is found in Greek E, also in Vatt. Ven. and in Latin Version and Coptic (*Ἰησοῦν* for *αὐτόν*). The reading *καὶ ἐζήτησαν τ. Ἰησ. κ. οὐχ εὗρον* is in Greek B C E. Perhaps *a* is a conflation of both readings.

[2] The omission in *a* of the words given in *β*: *neque ausi* to *invenimus in Arimathem* is no doubt due to homoioteleuton.

[3] Greek A and ed[pr] Lat. om. *Ἰσραήλ*.

Εἰρήνη σοι καὶ πάντα ὅσα σού ἐστι. οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἡμάρτομεν εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς σέ. εὐξάμενος τῷ θεῷ Ἰσραὴλ καταξίωσον ἐλθεῖν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας (καὶ πρὸς τὰ τέκνα) σου, ὅτι ἐλυπήθημεν ἅπαντες, ὅτε ἠνοίξαμεν τὰς θύρας καὶ οὐχ εὕρομέν σε. οἴδαμεν ὅτι βουλὴν κακὴν ἐβουλευσάμεθα περὶ σοῦ, ἀλλά σου ὁ θεὸς ἀντελάβετο καὶ (αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος) διεσκέδασεν τὴν βουλὴν ἡμῶν, ἣν περί σου ἐβουλευσάμεθα, τίμιε πάτερ Ἰωσήφ, τίμιε παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ.

Καὶ ἐξελέξαντο (ἀπὸ παντὸς Ἰσραὴλ) ἄνδρας ἑπτὰ οἳ ἐφίλουν τὸν Ἰωσήφ, οὓς (καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰωσὴφ) ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτοῦ φίλους. Καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι (καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ λευῖται πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας)· βλέπετε, εἰ δεξάμενος τὴν ἐπιστολὴν παρ᾽ ἡμῶν καὶ ἀναγνῷ, γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐλεύσεται[1] *πρὸς ἡμᾶς· εἰ δὲ δεξάμενος τὴν ἐπιστολὴν μὴ ἀναγνῷ, οἴδατε ὅτι κεκάκωται. ἀσπάζεσθε αὐτὸν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς ἡμᾶς.*

Pax tibi et omnibus quae tua sunt. Novimus quia peccavimus in deum et in te: et preca*mu*r deum Israel, ut *dignum faciat te* venire ad patres tuos, quia contristati sumus omnes, quum aperuimus *ianuam* neque invenimus te. Novimus quia *consiliati sumus de te consilium malum, sed dominus suscepit te* et dissipavit consilium nostrum quod de te consiliati sumus, [O] pater Honorandus, Ioseph honoratus *ante oculos nostros* et ab omni populo.

Et elegerunt viros septem qui amabant Ioseph, noverat illos *sicut* amicos, et dicunt [ad eos] *principes sacerdotum*: Videte: si quum susce*perit* epistolam a vobis et *legerit, sciatis* quia *vult venire* ad nos; si autem quum accipiat litteras non legerit, scietis quia malignatur [vir adversus nos], salutantes eum in pace revertimini ad nos. Benedicentes autem *viros* dimi-

[1] ἐλεύσεται] The Arm. = 'will mix with us,' perhaps ὁμιλήσει.

ηὐλόγησαν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀπέλυσαν. καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ἄνδρες εἰς Ἀριμαθὲμ πρὸς Ἰωσήφ, προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ καὶ λέγουσιν (αὐτῷ)· εἰρήνη σοι καὶ πάντα ὅσα σού ἐστι. κἀκεῖνος λέγει (αὐτοῖς). εἰρήνη ὑμῖν καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ. καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιστολήν, καὶ δεξάμενος (ὁ Ἰωσὴφ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν) ἀνέγνω, καὶ κατεφίλησεν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν θεὸν καὶ λέγει οὕτως· εὐλογητὸς ὁ κύριος, ὃς ἐξαπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσκέπασέν με ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ. καὶ Ἰωσὴφ κατεφίλησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς τράπεζαν, καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον, καὶ ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐκεῖ.

[a] Hos. 6. 1.

Καὶ ὀρθρίσαντες[a] ηὔξαντο. καὶ ἔστρωσεν Ἰωσὴφ τὴν ὄνον (αὐτοῦ) καὶ ἐπορεύθη μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν Ἱερουσαλήμ. καὶ ὑπήντησεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς (Ἰσραὴλ τῷ Ἰωσήφ), ἔκραξαν λέγοντες· εἰρήνη εἰσόδῳ σου. καὶ λέγει Ἰωσὴφ πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαόν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, καὶ κατεφίλησεν πάντα τὸν λαόν. καὶ ἐξίσταντο ὡς εἶδον αὐτόν. καὶ ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν Νικόδημος (εἰς τὸν

serunt. Venerunt autem viri in Arimathem ad Ioseph, adoraverunt eum et dicunt: Pax tibi et omni quod tui est. Et ille dicit: Pax vobis et omni populo *Domini.* Et dederunt ei epistolam. *Suscipiens* autem *legit*, et osculatus est epistolam, benedixitque deum et di*xit* hoc modo: Benedictus dominus, qui misit angelum suum et cooperuit me sub alis suis. *Osculatus est etiam eos Ioseph* et apposuit eis mensam, manducaverunt et biberunt, et *dormierunt* ibi.

Et mane surgentes precati sunt; et stravit Ioseph asinum et ambulavit cum illis, et introit in sanctam civitatem Ierusalem. Et occurrit *omni populo*; clamabant [omnes] dicentes: Pax in introitu tuo. Ait Ioseph ad omnem populum, Pax vobis. *Et salutaverunt omnes eum*, et mirabantur *qui* vide*bant* eum. Et suscepit eum Nicodemus, et fecit convivium ei.

οἶκον αὐτοῦ), καὶ ἐποίησεν δοχὴν (μεγάλην). καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἄνναν καὶ Καϊάφαν καὶ τοὺς λευίτας εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον καὶ εὐφράνθησαν σὺν τῷ Ἰωσήφ, καὶ ὑμνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ Ἰωσὴφ ἔμεινεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Νικοδήμου.

(Καὶ ὑπήντησεν αὐτοῖς Νικόδημος) καὶ λέγει· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ. καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κῆπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤκουσεν ἅπαν τὸ συνέδριον [1], *καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἐκάθισε μέσον Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα. (ἀνοίξας δὲ) Νικόδημος (τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ) λέγει τῷ Ἰωσήφ· πάτερ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ τίμιε (παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἶδας ὅτι) οἱ τίμιοι διδάσκαλοι (καὶ ἱερεῖς) ζητοῦσιν παρὰ σοῦ μαθεῖν ῥῆμά τι. καὶ λέγει Ἰωσήφ·*

Vocavit Annam et Caipham [et seniores] et Levitas in domum suam. Manducabant et bibebant et gavisi sunt cum Ioseph et benedi*xerunt* deum, [et] iverunt [unusquisque] in domum suam. Ioseph [vero] remansit [in domo Nicodemi.

Postera autem die, parasceve [2] erat; vigilaverunt sacerdotum principes et Levitae] [3] ad domum Nicodemi et dicunt. Pax tibi et Ioseph, [et salutaverunt inter sese.] Et [excipiens] eos [Nicodemus] *introduxit* in hortum suam. *Sederunt omnes* et Ioseph in medio *eorum* : [et nemo ausus est quaerere verbum. Deinde dicit ad eos Ioseph : Ut quid vocastis me? Illi vero innuerunt Nicodemo ut loqueretur cum Ioseph. Deinde] dicit [Nicodemus] ad Ioseph : Pater honorande Ioseph, *venerandi et didascali synagogae volunt quaerere a te verbum.* Dixit Ioseph

---

[1] Arm. = 'the public.' Just before լուաւ = *ἤκουσεν* must be a corruption of նստաւ = *ἐκαθέσθη*.

---

[2] This omission in *a* may be due to homoioteleuton. [3] *γ* omits.

ἐρωτήσατε. Καὶ ἔλαβον τὸν νόμον Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας καὶ ὥρκισαν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ λέγοντες· δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ Ἰσραήλ, (καὶ δὸς αὐτῷ εὐχαριστίαν· ὅτι Ἄχαρ ὡρκίσθη παρὰ τοῦ προφήτου τοῦ υἱοῦ Ναυὴ καὶ οὐκ ἐπιώρκησεν, ἀλλὰ ἀνήγγειλεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔκρυψεν ῥῆμά τι·)[1] μὴ κρύψῃς ἀφ' ἡμῶν (ἕως ἑνὸς καὶ ἑνὸς ῥήματος). καὶ λέγει Ἰωσήφ· ζῇ ὁ κύριος ἐὰν κρύψω ἀφ' ὑμῶν ῥῆμα ἕν. καὶ λέγουσι (πρὸς αὐτόν). λύπῃ ἐλυπήθημεν ὅτε ᾐτήσω τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐνετύλιξας αὐτὸ καθαραῖς σινδόσι καὶ ἔθηκας αὐτὸν ἐν (καινῷ) μνήματι. διὰ τοῦτο ἀπεκλείσαμέν σε ἐν οἴκῳ (ὅπου οὐκ ἦν θυρίς, καὶ ἐπεθήκαμεν κλεῖδας καὶ σφραγῖδας ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν καὶ παραφύλακας ὅπου ἦς κεκλεισμένος)[2], καὶ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου ἠνοίξαμεν τὰς θύρας καὶ οὐχ εὕραμέν σε, ἐλυπήθημεν σφόδρα, καὶ ἔκστασις ἐπέπεσεν ἐφ' (ἡμᾶς καὶ πάντα) τὸν λαόν.

Καὶ νῦν ἀνάγγειλον ἡμῖν τί γέγονας. Λέγει (αὐτοῖς) Ἰωσήφ· τῇ παρασκευῇ ἐνδεκάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἀπεκλείσατέ με, καὶ

[Nicodemo]: *Dicant. Tollentes autem Annas et Caiphas librum legum* adiuraverunt Ioseph dicentes: Da gloriam deo Israel, *et quaecunque interrogamus* ne abscondas a nobis. Dicit [ad eos] Ioseph: Vivit dominus si abscondam a vobis verbum unum. Et dicunt: Contristati magna tristitia sumus *quoniam* petisti corpus Iesu et involvisti illud munda sindone et *sepelisti* eum in monumento [tuo]. Ideo inclusimus te in *carcere*: et una sabbati aperientes ianuas non invenimus te. Contristatique sumus valde et *stupor* irruit super populum [usque hodie]. Annuntia ergo nobis quae *sunt facta tibi.*

Inquit Ioseph: In [die] parasceve circa *decimam*

---

[1] The Latin texts omit the same words as *β*, at least from ὅτι Ἄχαρ and mostly reject one of the clauses beginning with δός. The Coptic and Greek texts retain these words, which are surely necessary as giving a reason why Joseph was to thank the God of Israel.

[2] All sources except the Latin B retain the words here omitted by *β*.

ἔμεινα τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου πλήρη[1]. *καὶ μεσούσης νυκτὸς εὐχομένου μου*[2], *ὁ οἶκος ὅπου ἐνεκλείσατέ με ἐκρεμάσθη ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων γωνιῶν, καὶ ὡς ἀστραπὴν (φωτὸς εἶδον) πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν. καὶ ἔμφοβος γενόμενος ἔπεσα χαμαί. καὶ ἐπελάβετο (τῆς χειρός μου) καὶ ἐξέβαλέν με ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἐγκεκλεισμένος ἤμην, καὶ ἰκμὰς ὑδάτων ἐπέπεσέν με (μέχρι τῶν ποδῶν μου). καὶ προσελθὼν*[3] *ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου κατεφίλησέν με καὶ λέγει μοι· Ἰωσήφ, μὴ φοβοῦ. ἄνοιξον τοὺς ὀφαλμούς σου καὶ ἴδε τίς λαλεῖ πρός σε. καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἶδον τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ ἔντρομος γενόμενος ἐδόκουν*[a] *ὅτι φάντασμά τι εἴη. (καὶ τὰ προστάγματα ἔλεγον)*[4] *καὶ ἠρξάμην ἐκ τῶν ἐντολῶν λέγειν· καὶ αὐτὸς συνελάλει*

[a] Mar. 6. 49; Mat. 14. 26.

horam inclusistis me [in carcerem], et mansi sabbatum diem totum. Quum media nox esset, stante me in oratione, suspensa[5] est a quattuor angulis, veluti coruscus luminis ante oculos meos. Et *exterritus in terram* cecidi. *Apprehendit et elevavit* me a loco ubi *cecideram* et humiditas aquae incidit super me [et odor perculit nares meas sicut suavis aromatis;] et adveniens *ad me* osculatus est me et dixit mihi: Ioseph ne time, aperi oculos tuos et vide quis [est qui] loquitur tibi. Intendens autem vidi Iesum, extimui et puta*bam fantasma* esse. Et coepi e mandatis recitare: ipse vero colloquebatur mecum. Et vos non

---

[1] Or perhaps *ὅλην*.

[2] The Arm. = 'while I stood in prayer.' This is the ordinary equivalent of *εὐχομένου μου*, but not inconsistent with *στήκοντός* (or *ἱσταμένου*) *μου καὶ εὐχομένου* which is read in the Greek texts.

[3] The Greek texts have *ἐκμάξας*, a sense which the Arm. cannot yield. The Arm. = 'having come near' or 'having put near.'

[4] The reading of *a* would seem to be a conflation of *καὶ τὰ προστ. ἔλεγον* given in Greek B C and *καὶ ἠρξάμην λέγειν τὰ προσ.* of Greek E, only *ἐντόλη* or some similar word is translated in the second clause. The old Latin also has different words: *oratione autem et praeceptis loquebar ei.*

---

[5] The equivalent of *domus ubi inclusistis me* must have dropped out of the *β* text.

μοι. καὶ ὑμεῖς γε οἴδατε ὅτι, ἐὰν φάντασμα συναντήσει τινὶ καὶ ἀκούσῃ τὰ ῥήματα τῶν προσταγμάτων, φυγῇ φεύξει· καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι συνελάλει μοι, εἶπον (αὐτῷ)· ῥαββὶ Ἠλία[a]. καὶ λέγει μοι· οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ Ἠλίας. εἶπον αὐτῷ· σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ, κύριε; καὶ λέγει· εἰμὶ ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς, οὗ τὸ σῶμα ᾐτήσω παρὰ Πιλάτου καὶ ἐνετύλιξας ἐν καθαραῖς σινδόσι καὶ σουδάριον ἔθηκας ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου καὶ ἔθηκάς με ἐν καίνῳ[b] μνήματι, καὶ ἐκύλισας λίθον τινὰ μέγαν, θύραν τοῦ μνήματος. καὶ εἶπον (τῷ λαλοῦντί μοι)· δεῖξόν μοι τὸν τόπον[c] (ὅπου ἔθηκά σε). ἀπήγαγέ με, καὶ ἔδειξέ μοι τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἐτέθη αὐτὸς καὶ σινδόνιόν τι ᾧ περιεζωσμένος ἦν, καὶ τὸ σουδάριον τὸ εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔκειτο[d] αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐπέγνων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἦν, καὶ ἐπελάβετο τῆς χειρός μου καὶ ἔστησέν με τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ οἴκου μου, καὶ ἀνέπαυσέν με εἰς τὴν κλίνην μου καὶ λέγει μοι· ἕως τεσσαράκοντα[e]

[a] Jno. 1. 21, 22.
[b] Mat. 27. 60 and Jno. 11. 41.
[c] Mar. 16. 6 and Jno. 20. 15.
[d] Jno. 20. 5–7.
[e] Acts 1. 3, 4.

ignoratis, si phantasma cuivis occurrat et audierit verba mandatorum, fuga fugit. Quum loqueretur ad me, dixi: Rabbi, Elias? Et dicit mihi: Non sum ego Elias. Et dixi ad eum: *Quis es tu domine?* Et dicit *mihi Ego sum* Iesus, cuius corpus petisti a Pilato et involvisti in munda sindone, et sudario *operuisti caput meum*, et in novo monumento posuisti me, et advolvisti lapidem magnum ostium monumenti. Dixi autem *ei*: [Veni] ostende mihi locum. Et duxit me [in locum ubi posui ego eum]. *Vidi sindonem, sudariumque quo involveram caput eius: deinde* cognovi quia Iesus est. Et *apprehendens* manum meam *duxit* me [in Arimathem et] clausis ostiis *introduxit me in domum meam*; reposuitque *in lectulo meo*, dicitque mihi: [Pax tecum. Deinde osculatus est me et dicit[1]:]

---

[1] This omission in *a* is probably due to homoioteleuton. No other source presents it.

ἡμερῶν μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐξ οἴκου σου· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐγὼ πορεύσομαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου εἰς Γαλιλαίαν.

Caput XVI.

Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἐξεκεντήθησαν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡσεὶ νεκροὶ[a] καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαὶ καὶ ἐμνήστευσαν ἕως ἐνάτης ὥρας. καὶ παρεκάλουν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ καὶ τὸν Νικόδημον, τὸν Ἄνναν καὶ τὸν Καϊάφαν καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς λέγοντες· ἀνάστητε, στῆτε ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν, γεύσασθε ἄρτον καὶ ἐνισχύσατε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, ὅτι αὔριον σάββατον ἐστίν. καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν (ἕκαστος) εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

[a] Mat. 28. 4.

Τῷ δὲ σαββάτῳ ἐκάθισαν οἱ διδάσκαλοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ λευῖται συνεζήτουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ ἔλεγον.

Usque quadraginta dies non exire de domo tua: *ecce* ego vad*o* ad fratres meos in Galilaeam.

Caput XVI.

Quum audivissent verba ista a Ioseph sacerdotum principes et scribae et omnis senatus synagogae facti sunt tanquam mortui; et ceciderunt in terram, et ieiunaverunt [diem illum] usque ad nonam horam. *Deinde* Nicodemus et Ioseph rogaverunt *eos* dicentes: Surgite state super pedes vestros, et gustate *et confirmate* animas, quoniam crastina die sabbatum [domini] est. [Et surrexerunt, in oratione stabant ad deum, et manducaverunt et biberunt[1]], et abierunt in domum suam.

Sabbato autem sederunt *archisynagogae et seniores et Pharisaei*, disserebant ad invicem et dicebant: Quae

[1] An omission due to homoioteleuton.

a 1 Th. 2. 16.

τίς ἡ ὀργὴ ἣ **ἔφθασεν**[a] ἐφ' ἡμᾶς; ὅτι οἴδαμεν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα. Λέγει Λευὶς ὁ διδάσκαλος· τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα οἴδαμεν φοβουμένους τὸν θεόν, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς μὴ ἀποστεροῦντας καὶ τὰς δεκάτας ἀποδίδοντας τρὶς[1] τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ. καὶ ὅτε ἐγεννήθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς προσήνεγκαν (αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ) εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, καὶ θυσίας καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα ἔδωκαν τῷ θεῷ. καὶ ὅτε ἔλαβεν αὐτὸν ὁ μέγας διδάσκαλος Συμεὼν

b Lu. 2. 28 ff.

[b] **εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας αὐτοῦ, λέγει· νῦν ἀπολύεις, δέσποτα, τὸν δοῦλόν σου κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου. ὅτι εἶδον ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου.** ηὐλόγησεν αὐτὸν **Συμέων καὶ λέγει πρὸς Μαριὰμ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ·** εὐαγγελιζόμεθά σοι περὶ τοῦ παιδίου τούτου. καὶ λέγει Μαριάμ· ἀγαθόν, κύριέ μου. καὶ λέγει Συμεών· (ἀγαθόν ἐστιν.) ἰδοὺ οὗτος εἴη **πτῶσις καὶ ἀνά-**

est *iracundia* quae supervenit nobis? quia novimus patrem et matrem eius. *Respondit* Levi didascalus et inquit: *Parentes* eius novimus, [quia] timentes [erant] deum, vota non morabantur et decimas *dabant* [ter] in anno. Et quando paruerunt Iesum, adduxerunt in locos hos, et holocausta et sacrificia dederunt deo. Et quum magnus didascalus Simeon *accepit* eum in brachia sua, dicit: Nunc dimitte domine servum tuum, secundum verbum tuum in pace: quia viderunt oculi mei salutare tuum, [quod parasti ante faciem omnium populorum. Et] benedixit *eos* Simeon et dixit ad Mariam matrem eius: Annunti*o* tibi de puero isto. Et dicit Maria: Bonum est, domine mi. *Iterum* dicit Simeon: Ecce fiet hic in ruinam et in restorationem [multorum in Israel], et in signum contradictionis[2]: [et tuam

[1] There is a slight corruption of the text here in *a*. I have rendered it as it must have stood.

[2] Some Latin sources read *contradictionis*, implied both by the Armenian A. P. in Lat. D^{abc} and by the Armenian vulgate.

στασις καὶ σημεῖον ἀντιλογίας[1]**, ἵνα ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί**[b].

Λέγουσιν τῷ διδασκάλῳ Λευί· τοῦτο σὺ πόθεν οἶδας; λέγει Λευί· οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔμαθον τὸν νόμον; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ τὸ Συνέδριον· τὸν πατέρα σου θέλομεν ἰδεῖν. προσήνεγκαν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ (ἔμπροσθεν) καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγει· τί ἐστὶν ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε τοῖς υἱοῖς μου; ὁ μακάριος Συμεὼν ἐδίδαξεν αὐτῷ τὸν νόμον.

Λέγουσιν (τὸ συνέδριον τῷ διδασκάλῳ) Λευί· ἀληθές ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησας. λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἀληθές ἐστιν.

Λέγουσιν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς· δεῦτε ἀποστείλωμεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν πρὸς τοὺς τρεῖς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐλθόντας καὶ ἐξηγησαμένους περὶ τοῦ διδάσκειν αὐτόν, καὶ εἴπωσιν ἡμῖν πῶς εἶδον αὐτὸν ἀνα-

quidem animam pertransibit gladius,] ut revelentur multis in cordibus cogitationes.

Dicunt *sacerdotum principes* ad Levi: Ista *verba tua quomodo audisti?* Dicit [ad eos] Levi: Non scitis quia ab ipso didici legem? Dicunt ipsi senatus: Patrem tuum volumus videre. [Deinde] *vocaverunt* patrem eius et scrutati sunt eum, et dicit *eis*: *Quid* non credidistis *filio meo?* [Nescitis quia] beatus [et iustus] Simeon docuit eum legem. *Atque iterum* dicunt ad Levi: [deus scit] *ea quae vere dicta sunt.* Dicunt inter sese *principes sacerdotum et Levitae*: Venite mittamus in Galilaeam ad tres viros qui huc venerunt et narraverunt de docendo eius [discipulos], et dicent nobis quomodo viderunt eum assumptum in

---

[1] **The joint presentation of *ἀντιλογίας* in some old Latin texts of the A. P., in *α* and *β* and in the Armenian vulgate, suggests that *ἀντιλογίας* stood also in some canonical texts. The omissions of *α* in this passage are not due to homoioteleuton. They probably represent the original text of A. P., to which *β* and other sources have added from the canonical books.**

λημφθέντα. καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος (οὗτος) πᾶσιν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν τοὺς τρεῖς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐλθόντας μετ᾽ αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτούς· εἴπατε ῥαββὶ[1] Ἀδδᾷ καὶ ῥαββὶ Φίλεος, καὶ ῥαββὶ Ἐγίῳ εἰρήνη ὑμῖν καὶ πάντα ὅσα ὑμῶν ἐστιν. ζητήσεως πολλῆς γενομένης ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, ἀπεστάλημεν τοῦ καλέσαι ὑμᾶς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους τόπους Ἰσραήλ.

Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες καὶ εὗρον αὐτοὺς καθεζομένους καὶ μελετοῦντας τὸν νόμον. ἠσπάσαντο αὐτοὺς ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες πρὸς τοὺς ἀπελθόντας πρὸς αὐτούς· εἰρήνη (ἐστὶν) παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ. καὶ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν· εἰρήνη ἐστίν. λέγουσιν αὐτοῖς· εἰς τί ἤλθατε; λέγουσιν· καλεῖ ὑμᾶς τὸ συνέδριον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

Ὡς ἤκουσαν οἱ ἄνδρες ὅτι ζητοῦνται ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, ηὔξαντο τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀνεκλίθησαν μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν,

caelum. Et complacuit sermo iste omnibus. Miserunt tres viros qui venerant cum ipsis in Galilaeam: dicite rabbi[2] Addae et rabbi Fileas et rabbi Egiae: Pax vobis et omnibus quae vestra sunt. *Disquisitio* facta est [de multis rebus: ideo] misimus [viros istos ad vos] *ut digni simus ire vobis*[3] *in* sanctam *civitatem, Ierusalem.*

Et profecti sunt viri [in Galilaeam], invenerunt eos sedentes et *meditantes* legem. Salutaverunt eos in pace. Et dicunt *illi ad illos qui venerunt*: Pax omni populo Israel. Illique dicunt: Pax est, *et vocaverunt vos archisynagogae,* in sanctam civitatem Ierusalem. Audientes quia quaeruntur a concilio, oraverunt deum, et recubuerunt cum viris, manduca-

[1] The Arm. translates by the word *վարդապետ*, which means *διδάσκαλος*.

[2] The one word 'vardapet' is used indifferently in the Armenian to render both *ῥαββί* and *διδάσκαλος*.

[3] Perhaps the Greek original read *ἵνα ἀξιῶμεν ἔρχεσθαι ὑμᾶς*.

ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον, καὶ ἀνέστησαν καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐκαθέσθη (τὸ συνέδριον) ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, ἐπερώτησαν αὐτοὺς καὶ λέγουσιν· ὄντως εἴδατε τὸν Ἰησοῦν καθεζόμενον εἰς τὸ ὄρος Μαμβρὴχ καὶ διδάσκοντα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἴδατε αὐτὸν ἀναληφθέντα εἰς οὐρανόν; ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ λέγουσιν· ἀληθῶς ἴδομεν αὐτὸν ἀναληφθέντα.

Λέγουσιν Ἄννας (καὶ Καϊάφας)· ἄρατε[1] αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων (καὶ ἴδωμεν εἰ συμφωνοῦσιν[2]. Καὶ ἦραν[1] αὐτούς.) παρήγαγον πρῶτον τὸν Ἀδδᾶ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ. εἰπὲ ἡμῖν, πῶς ἴδετε αὐτὸν καθεζόμενον. λέγει Ἀδδᾶς· ἔτι καθεζομένου αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Μαμβρήχ, διδάσκοντος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, εἴδομεν νεφέλην[a] ἐπισκιάζουσαν αὐτὸν (καὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ)[3], καὶ

[a] Acts 1. 9 and Mar. 9. 7.

verunt et biberunt cum eis, et surgentes sunt profecti Ierusalem.

Et in crastino sederunt in concilio; interrogaverunt eos dicentes: Verene vidistis Iesum sedentem in monte *Sambrelech* docentem *undecim* discipulos suos et vidistis eum assumptum in caelum? Responderunt et aiunt verum est; vidimus eum ascendentem in caelum.

Dicit Annas: separate istos invicem. Adduxerunt primum Addam. *Ait* [Annas]: dic nobis quomodo vid*isti* eum ascendentem in caelos. Ait Addas: Dum sedebat in monte Sambrelech et docebat discipulos suos vidimus nubem obumbrantem eum, et ascendit [nubes] in caelum; et discipuli eius orabant prostrati

---

[1] Arm. = 'separate.'

[2] Arm. = *si unum sermonem dicunt*. The words here omitted in β are essential to the sense and must have stood in the original text. The Greek C omits them through homoioteleuton; β probably omits from same cause.

[3] Greek, Latin, and Coptic retain the words omitted in β.

ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ηὔξαντο κείμενοι ἐπὶ πρόσωπον[a] αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆν. Ἐκάλεσαν τὸν Φιλέον ἱερέα, ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν· πῶς ἴδες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀναληφθέντα; καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει ὡσαύτως. (ἠρώτησαν τὸν Ἐγίαν, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ αὐτὸ εἶπεν.)[1] Λέγουσιν τὸ συνέδριον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως γέγραπται· ἐκ στομάτων δύο καὶ τριῶν σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα. λέγει Ἀβουδὴν διδάσκαλος· γέγραπται ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, περιεπάτει Ἐνὼχ σὺν τῷ θεῷ, (καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη, ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός)[2]. Ἰαίριος διδάσκαλος λέγει· τοῦ ἁγίου Μωϋσέως (τὸν θάνατον) ἠκούσαμεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἴδαμεν τὴν ταφὴν αὐτοῦ ἕως τῆς σήμερον. Λευὶς ῥαββὶ λέγει· τί ἐστὶν ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ ῥαββὶ Συμεών, ὅτι εἶδεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. ἰδού, οὗτος πτῶσις καὶ ἀνάστασις πολλῶν καὶ σημεῖον ἀντιλογίας. Ἰσαὰκ ῥαββὶ λέγει· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ

[a] Mat. 26. 39.

super faciem in terra. Vocaverunt etiam Fileos sacerdotem, interrogaverunt ipsum dicentes: Quomodo vidisti *eum* ascendentem? Et ipse *eadem* dixit. Dicunt qui erant in concilio inter sese: In lege Moysis scriptum est: in ore duorum vel trium testium constabit omne verbum. Dicit Abuthen didascalus: Ambulavit Enoch[3] cum deo. Iairus didascalus dicit: Et sancti Moysis mortem audivimus, sed non vidimus eum: [scriptum est enim in lege domini: Mortuus est Moyses, et nemo cognoscit] *locum* eius usque hodie. Levi rabbi dixit: Quid est quod dixit rabbi Simeon quum videret Iesum? Ecce iste [fiet in] ruin*am* et *in* restitution*em* multorum, et *in* signum contradictionis? Isaac *sacerdos* dicit: [Scriptum est

[1] The omission of these words in *β* may easily be due to homoioteleuton.

[2] This omission in *β* may be due to homoioteleuton. They come in all other sources.

[3] The Arm. text is slightly corrupt here and the words answering to *scriptum est in lege* seem to have dropped out through homoioteleuton.

ἀποστελῶ τὸν ἄγγελόν μου τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου δοθήσεται αὐτῷ.

Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας λέγουσιν· ὀρθῶς εἴπατε τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως, ὅτι τοῦ Ἐνὼχ θάνατον οὐδεὶς εἶδεν (καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἠλία θάνατον οὐδεὶς ὠνόμασεν)· ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς λόγον ἔδωκεν τῷ Πιλάτῳ, ὅτι εἴδαμεν αὐτὸν [a] ῥαπιζόμενον καὶ ἐμπτύσματα λαβόντα εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον [a] αὐτοῦ, καὶ στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν [b] ἔθηκαν [c] αὐτῷ οἱ στρατιῶται· ἐφραγελλώθη καὶ ἀπόφασιν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπὶ πέτρας [1] ἐσταυρώθη καὶ Δημᾶς καὶ Γεστᾶς (δύο) λῃσταὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτι [d] λόγχῃ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ ἐξεκέντησεν Λογγῖνος στρατιώτης, καὶ ὅτι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ᾐτήσατο ὁ τίμιος πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ ὅτι ἀνέστη (καθὼς λέγει καὶ) καθὼς λέγουσιν οἱ τρεῖς διδάσκαλοι· εἴδομεν αὐτὸν ἀναληφθέντα [e] εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν [e], καὶ ὅτι Λευὶ (ὁ διδάσκαλος) μαρτυρεῖ τὰ λεχθέντα τῷ Συμεῶνι.

[a] Mat. 26. 67.
[b] Mat. 27. 29.
[c] Mar. 15. 17.
[d] Jno. 19. 34.
[e] Mar. 16. 19.

in libro legum:] Ecce ego mit*to* angelum meum [ante faciem tuam et praeparabit viam tuam].

Annas et Caiphas dicunt: Recte dixistis; [nonne] scriptum est in lege Moysis, quia Enochi mortem nemo vidit. Iesus *autem stetit ante* Pilatum et *iudicatus est*, quia vidimus eum alapis perculsum et sputa accipientem in faciem suam, et coronam de spinis *in caput eius; a militibus* flagellatus est, et sententiam [mortis] accepit a Pilato; et crucifixus est *in loco golgothae*, et Gestas et Demas latrones cum eo; et quia lancea latus eius perforavit Lingianus miles; et quia corpus eius postulavit honorabilis pater noster Ioseph, et resurrexit sicut dicunt tres didascali, vidimus ipsum ascendentem in caelum. Et quia Levi est testificatus

[1] =‘on a rock’: β = ‘in loco Golgothae,’ agreeing with the Greek G ἐπὶ τόπου κρανίου. The Latin omits.

[a] Gal. 3. 13 and Deut. 21. 23.

Λέγουσιν οἱ διδάσκαλοι πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαόν· παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστι θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. γινώσκοντες γνώσεσθε, οἶκος Ἰακώβ, ὅτι[a] *γέγραπται·* **ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ ἐπὶ ξύλου κρεμάμενος**[a]. *παρήγγειλαν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι καὶ ἱερεῖς παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραὴλ λέγοντες· ἐπικατάρατος εἴη πᾶς ὁ ἀνὴρ ὃς προσκυνεῖ κτίσματα παρὰ*[1] *τὸν κτίσαντα. καὶ εἶπον πᾶς ὁ λαός· ἀμήν, ἀμήν, ἀμήν.*

Καὶ ὕμνησεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τὸν κύριον καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. καὶ Χριστῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

quod Simeon *dixit*: [Hic fiet in ruinam et in restitutionem multorum in medio Israel, et in signum contradictionis. Iterumque] dixe*runt* doctores et omnes populi, si a domino factum est hoc, et est mirabile ante oculos nostros, sciendo scite, domus ista Iacobi, quoniam scriptum est quia maledictus est omnis quicunque pendens remaneat in ligno. Sed Scriptura monet, dei qui caelum et terras non fecerunt pereant. Et] praeceptum dederunt omni multitudini Israel, [sacerdotum principes et Levitae,] dicentes: maledictus sit omnis vir qui adoret creaturas et non creatorem. Et *ait* omnis multitudo *fiat*, *fiat*.

Et benedixit omnis plebs *deo*, [et dicunt: Benedictus domine deus, qui dedit requiem omni populo Israel, secundum omne quod locutus est. Et sit dominus deus noster cum nobis, sicut cum patribus nostris.] Et [laudantes dominum] ambulaverunt unusquisque in domum suam. [Et novi populi qui e gentibus emittamus hymnos et gloriam Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, nunc et semper et in aeternitates aeternitatum. Amen.]

---

[1] Arm. = '*and not* the creator.'

IV.

THE PURPOSE OF THE WORLD-PROCESS AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AS EXPLAINED IN THE CLEMENTINE AND LACTANTIAN WRITINGS IN A SYSTEM OF SUBORDINATE DUALISM.

[F. W. Bussell.]

PART I.

GOD AS CREATOR AND JUDGE.

§ 1. It may be boldly asserted that the main point at issue in the Ante-Nicene controversies and the Cardinal doctrine of the Fathers in the first three centuries, is the Personality of God, and His interest in the world. Even the subject of Incarnation and Redemption may be said for a time to be subordinate. 'Of what sort was the God whom Christ came to reveal?' By degrees the question assumed a different form, 'Is not the manifestation of the Divine Nature in Christ our only guide? "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also"'. The world in its ceaseless interrogation of the historic Christ, passes through the same stages as Philip, believing that the Saviour came to preach an unknown Father, until convinced that not in some esoteric knowledge of the inscrutable, but in the life and character of Jesus lay the secret of the new revelation. In fact, in this announcement was a reaction against a then prevalent and mistaken reverence, in which lay a great peril to practical piety. In the religious world of both Greeks and Jews, and especially in that amalgam which united both, the divine conception had been gradually divested of character, affections, or titles

in any way akin to mankind. In the end the Athenians had been right, on the assumption that they followed Plato and Aristotle. The unknown God was the only one which was left to them; an infinite sea of goodness, or an attenuated Final Cause. The Septuagint takes pains to respectfully correct those passages in the Old Testament which represent the Almighty as having bodily parts; as actuated by motives or swayed by affections which have their counterpart in man. PHILO JUDAEUS is always tending towards a neuter and impersonal notion of God (*τὸ θεῖον, τὸ ὄν*), as if attempting to separate and (perhaps) hypostatize all those qualities, characteristics, or actions in the Divine Being, on which the idea of *Providence* depends. 'God is after all unknowable; the divine word (*θεῖος λόγος*) is God in relation to us, so far as we can know Him and appreciate His manifestation;—His existence rather than His essence. It is this second God who has made the world[1], and presides over its destinies in the two spheres of Nature and History, even he perhaps not directly or by immediate contact, but through his principal powers, the Creative and the Kingly (*ποιητική* and *βασιλική*). Of these

[1] NUMENIUS, in EUSEBIUS, Pr. Ev. xi. 18 *καὶ γὰρ οὔτε δημιουργεῖν ἐστὶ χρεὼν τὸν πρῶτον, καὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦντος θεοῦ χρὴ εἶναι νομίζεσθαι πατέρα τὸν πρῶτον Θεόν .... ὁ θεὸς μέντοι ὁ δεύτερος καὶ τρίτος ἐστὶν εἷς· συμφερόμενος δὲ τῇ ὕλῃ δυάδι οὔσῃ ἑνοῖ μὲν αὐτήν, σχίζεται δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῆς .... καὶ ἀπερίοπτος ἑαυτοῦ γίνεται καὶ ἅπτεται τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ .... ὁ μὲν πρῶτος Θεὸς ἔσται ἑστὼς ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἔμπαλίν ἐστι κινούμενος .... διομολογησώμεθα ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ὁμολογίαν οὐκ ἀμφισβητήσιμον ἀκοῦσαι, τὸν μὲν πρῶτον Θεὸν ἀργὸν εἶναι ἔργων ξυμπάντων καὶ βασιλέα, τὸν δημιουργικὸν δὲ θεὺν ἡγεμονεῖν δι' οὐρανοῦ ἰόντα.*

APOLLONIUS, in EUS. iv. 13. The First God *δεῖται .... οὐδενὸς οὐδὲ παρὰ τῶν κρειττόνων ἤπερ ἡμεῖς, οὐδ' ἔστιν ὃ .... γῆ ἀνίησι φυτὸν ἢ τρέφει ζῶον ἢ ἀήρ, ᾧ μὴ πρόσεστί γέ τι μίασμα.* The present creation, nay, man himself all but his innermost spiritual centre, was essentially contemptible in the eyes of these speculators of the Imperial age.—PLUTARCH, Is. et Os. § 78 *ὁ δ' ἐστὶ μὲν αὐτὸς ἀπωτάτω τῆς γῆς ἄχραντος καὶ ἀμίαντος καὶ καθαρὸς οὐσίας ἁπάσης φθορὰν δεχομένης καὶ θάνατον. Ἀνθρώπων δὲ ψυχαῖς ἐνταυθοῖ μὲν ὑπὸ σωμάτων καὶ παθῶν περιεχομέναις οὐκ ἔστι μετουσία τοῦ Θεοῦ, πλὴν ὅσον ὀνείρατος ἀμαυροῦ θιγεῖν νοήσει διὰ φιλοσοφίας.* The only way to this God was on the Path of Knowledge; He could not be approached by the practical life.—The gnostical idea of the Second God, the Creator, has been adopted from this system in Tennyson.

the former is wholly good and merciful (Nature), while the apparent asperity of the latter (History) is due to human sin, and represents not so much an essential attribute of the λόγος, as *our* altered relation to his uniform benevolence.'

The Epicurean deity, whose existence rested on the credit of dreams and survived only in deference to popular fanaticism (Epicurus had no intention of emulating the fate of Socrates or the confessorship of Anaxagoras),—this god, I say, had been long since conducted to the extreme limits of the known Universe, and forbidden to meddle with the course of the world, either in *natural* law (of which he was himself a manifestation) or in *human* history (to which he was entirely indifferent). The Stoics, with their habitual and unpardonable offence of retaining language which they laboured to deprive of all significance, are loud in their praises of the divine goodness, and subtle in their arguments on behalf of Providence; but it is a goodness which is purposeless, and a Providence which is unconscious. And it is only this poetic language of religious sentiment, which preserves the Stoics from the charge of atheism, or a blank admiration of physical force; of a certain steady equipoise or proportion in the Universe. It is also worthy of careful notice that those of the School who approach cosmogony from the *human* and the practical side, as Seneca and Aurelius, ever tend to a half-Platonic Mysticism; which, so far from identifying the 'god within' and the course of the world without, leaves them in reality in irreconcilable opposition. Lastly, the Platonist, if I may be allowed to speak at this point of the later development of the third century, insists with singular earnestness upon the doctrine of necessary Sequence, natural concomitance, as against creation: not by the will of God (προαιρέσει) but (τῷ εἶναι) by Emanation does this universe, whether of thoughts or things, arise[1]. The Gnostic meantime

[1] The idea of deliberate creation in Greek philosophy is only found in the half-myth of the *Timaeus*. Aristotle shifts the centre of gravity from

(against whose bitter discontent the genial optimism of Alexandria was to array its forces) involves the God and

a Personal God to the strivings of Nature after an unapproachable Ideal, who or which may be unconscious of it. Through PROCLUS, this notion that all orders gaze upwards, and not down on their suffering inferiors, enters Western thought with DIONYSIUS AREOPAGITA and ERIGENA. PLOTINUS clearly expresses a widely current opinion, Enn. v. 2, 1: *ὂν γὰρ τέλειον τῷ μηδὲν ζητεῖν μηδὲ ἔχειν μηδὲ δεῖσθαι, οἷον ὑπερερρύη καὶ τὸ ὑπερπλῆρες Αὐτοῦ πεποίηκεν ἄλλο· τὸ δὲ γενόμενον εἰς Αὐτὸ ἐπεστράφη καὶ ἐπληρώθη καὶ ἐγένετο πρὸς Αὐτὸ βλέπον καὶ* Νοῦς *οὕτως*. The Higher Powers do not indeed perceive that virtue is gone out of them: they are unaware of what is after all a degeneration or an abortion (*ὑστέρημα, ἔκτρωμα*). Plato, I believe, stands alone in anticipating the Christian view (though, no doubt, imperfectly), that the world took its rise, not in a fluent passivity from an Original Source, but from the desire of the Creator to communicate His own goodness and happiness to other beings. 'How came it to be so?' asks Lotze (*Philos. of Rel.* xlvi). 'Is this transition to Reality an Emanation by natural necessity from God's Being? or is it the act of a Will which gave reality to that which understanding and imagination could only represent as possible? . . . .' (xlviii): 'If the Divine Thought of the World is to have a realization other than that which it already has in the Divine Mind, this can only be by God's creating *individual finite Spirits*, by His causing to arise in them the cosmic thoughts in question as external perceptions . . . . and at this rate Creation may be defined as follows; God permitted the thought, which at first was only His, to become the thought of other Spirits.' . . . . (li): 'We cannot wish to define the exact way in which Creation issued forth from the Creator, but only the import of the creative act, which is this: that with a view to the existence of the Spirit-World, *which of itself is no natural consequence flowing from the being of God, a Divine Will* was necessary . . . . And this is how the notion of *Creation* differs from that of an *Emanation* or development of this world.' . . . . (lii): 'Religious feeling has ever regarded as God's motive (in creating the world) the expansive love, which urges Him to communicate His holiness to other beings, and this thought quite satisfies the yearning in us, which led us to suppose that God *laboured* in creating the world; for according to it, the Creation arose not without this sympathy and enduring interest. It was not a matter-of-fact result flowing from the Divine Will, nor was that Will indifferent; rather is it true that God is bound up with Creation by a perpetual sympathy.' (*'Αγαθὸς ἦν, ἀγαθῷ δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίγνεται φθόνος· τούτου δ' ἐκτὸς ὢν πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα γένεσθαι ἐβουλήθη παραπλήσια ἑαυτῷ.*) A recent commentator on this passage warns us: 'Of course Plato's words are not to be interpreted with a crude literalness.' (!) What is the *Symbolic* or allegoric meaning of goodness? is a question which may arise in some minds. *φθόνος* is the characteristic feature of mythologic deities; indifference (the mean) of later philosophic substitutes; benevolence (conscious and determinate) at the root of things is a conception found but rarely: modern speculation has laboriously revived the antique belief in Jealousy or Indifference.

Creator of this world in his condemnation of its faults or inequalities, and professes to rise above this sphere to a Deity of unknown inexpressible transcendence, by the simple process of laying aside all the properties and attributes of man (and often all the virtues and decencies as well). It need hardly be pointed out that all these various views extend in the same direction; and are aimed against the humanity of the Divine. Whether the school starts from an admiration or from an abhorrence of the process of life, each will end in a final doctrine not dissimilar to Brâhmanism. In a word, the common object of all speculators in this epoch is to deny Creation, and to deny Providence; and if some seem to welcome the Christian dogma of Redemption and Reconciliation, this is only another term for the announcement of this denial. They worship not that which is, but that which is not[1].

§ 2. But the Christian religion restates the affinity of God with man, and is not ashamed to dwell almost exclusively on the anthropomorphic conception. The history of Christ brings home to us in a startling manner, a truth which was peculiarly unacceptable to the world just then; the supreme interest of God in His handiwork, and His sympathy with His creatures. To an age, which reverenced God just because of His distance and unapproachable majesty, it proclaims that He is very near, and that His providence is very minute. St. Paul may be said to correct the hyper-refinement of Athenian agnosticism by a return to the instinctive sense of affinity with God, in Aratus *τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἔσμεν*. Yet the Christian idea of sonship differs entirely from the Stoic *conception*, though not from the *language* of that school. When men, disquieted at the failure of political and social life, believed that the human race is of no more account than birds or insects, a new assurance of dignity, a new guarantee

[1] In the account of the Basilidian system depicted by HIPPOLYTUS, it is boldly said that all things yearn after the God who is not. *Ref. Haer.* VII. 22: Ἐκείνου γάρ, δι' ὑπερβολὴν κάλλους . . . πᾶσα φύσις ὀρέγεται.

of worth was given, which enabled each man to look upon his own personality, however to all seeming valueless, as, in a sense, the supreme end of all creation, nay, the cause of the historic sufferings of Godhead (*ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν*).

The preaching of the Gospel revives in a very striking way, the sense of personal dignity in man, and builds on this its ethical system (not as some superficially suppose, upon an appeal to altruism in the first place). God really created the world, and did so for a moral purpose. The visible universe is not the mere shadow, the inseparable correlate of His spiritual and unseen nature; but has been built, a temporary edifice to serve an eternal design.

Man (man the individual, not the race) becomes again the centre of the Universe, and is not a bubble blown about for a season by the winds of Chance or Fate, but possesses an intrinsic verity and the germ of an immortal existence. So far from being an accident in the great total of the Universe, a ripple on a troubled ocean soon to return thither indistinguishable whence it came forth, the Individual is the only reality; so far from being the puppet of an irresistible and unconscious power, his free will is the single ultimate fact of experience, his good will the one thing of final value. His welfare so far from being subordinate to any vague design of arbitrary power or desire for life, is sacrificed to nothing, but is the final end at which Creation aims. The pagan lost sight of the single life in admiration of the Macrocosm; and the sole remaining ethical duty or road to happiness was the loss of the fatal and perhaps impious dower of personality. The unit for the Jew was the Hebrew nation; and he appropriated to himself its failures and successes with the same earnest yet immature self-devotion that we find in Codrus or Decius. But the Christian saw in the world's course, a school for the discipline of character, the apprenticeship of the infant 'that was learning to become a citizen of

heaven'[1]. It would not be hard in theory to attack the Christian system as an inculcation of debasing selfishness, were not this accusation immediately contradicted by actual experience. For in this way only (such is the verdict gained by an unbiassed scrutiny of the several schools of *pagan* Individualism) does the value and use of this life appear, if it be not considered as an *accidental* or a *final* good, but as a means to an eternal end. The duties of social life, and genuine interest in others are only possible to those who see in the State (or even in the Church), not an organism whose corporate welfare or exterior prosperity is the final norm of good and bad, but a home of souls; and who discern, through the inequalities of faculty, talent, station, the brotherhood of man. The mists of Platonism which raises qualities and ideas to divine honours, and depreciates the singular, pass away in this more practical view of life. Such a religion is not only readily intelligible to the humblest capacity; but by it alone is the gifted speculator saved from despair at the meaningless futility of his own life, from contempt of the pettiness of others. For it cannot be deemed a satisfactory answer to the riddle of existence to discover that there is none.

§ 3. The Gospel of Christ is a vindication of the personal to the personal. It professes, as no other system does, to justify the world-process, the design of a creator, the dealings of Providence, to the individual consciousness. All other schemes, all other religions are at the mercy of a revolt of Egoism, and this is both natural and inevitable. (This is clear from the practical result of a perversion of Christianity itself, which emphasizing the divine attributes of omnipotence

[1] DIO CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Borysthenitica*, Oration 36:—The world we must call *μίαν . . . . εὐδαίμονα πολιτείαν, ... τὴν θεῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνίαν*, and if one shall include *σύμπαν τὸ Λογικόν*, men being numbered with gods, *ὡς παῖδες σὺν ἀνδράσι λέγονται μετέχειν πόλεως, φύσει πολῖται ὄντες, οὐ τῷ φρονεῖν τε καὶ πράττειν τὰ τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδὲ τῷ κοινωνεῖν τοῦ νόμου, ἀσύνετοι ἔτι ὄντες αὐτοῦ.*

and will to the exclusion of Love, refuses to justify its doctrine either to the individual reason or the moral sense. The only answer to every natural question put by instinct of justice or self-love, is with TERTULLIAN, '*quia Deus voluit.*' But the matter ends there: not only for children to whom a parent's command should be sufficient, but for grown men, who need an explanation, i. e. demand that a given edict should be justified to themselves. For the only explanation which satisfies is a reference to a personal will, making for a good and beneficent end. We cannot wonder then at J. S. Mill's remarks upon such a conception of deity, nor at the bitter attack at the French Revolution on the tyrannical and arbitrary rather than the paternal view, which not only does not console or encourage the individual, but irritates his natural and indeed commendable selfishness, by ignoring his welfare. This rebellion of Egoism whatever its final conclusion, is a sign of maturity. The youth is of age, and fancies he must claim admittance to his father's councils and secrets. It takes form first as a Sophistic disbelief in social convention and antique institutions, which appear to press heavily on the liberty of the more spirited and ingenious, or it may be represented as in the first book of the Bible, as the passing of adult reason out of the Paradise of children; where an apparently arbitrary command or restriction is first questioned and then transgressed[1]. The certainty of our own

[1] SCHELLING'S earliest work in Latin, an attempt to explain 'the very ancient philosopheme in Genesis iii, *de primâ Malorum hum. origine,*' is worth consulting. § 5. 'It is wrong to suppose as hitherto, mali moralis initia hoc capite describi. It is rather the decay of the Golden Age, a passing forth from primitive simplicity, the dawn of reason and intelligence, from which at once arise the conquests and the pains of civilized life. The cause of this "evil" is supposed by all to have been curiosity; this well agrees with Pandora's legend among the Greeks. The gates of a childish Paradise are closed for ever on the human race; they wander forth in search of the Ideal (rerum altiorum cupiditas), and their pioneer is the Snake, an inner spirit of discontent, which is cause of all unhappiness and of all advance.' § 6. 'It is Reason, driving us by main force out of the narrow realm of sense, promising us a home which we never reach, glories that we are never to behold!

existence is our most vivid experience in practical life; and those who after the advice of Seneca to Lucilius, 'alternate solitude with Society' and thus are neither immersed in the State nor completely anchoritic,—are brought to a conclusion that may seem vain and indemonstrable, but is inevitable: that the world is formed to produce self-consciousness; that it cannot be the design (if at this stage such a term is admissible)—the design of the world-process to extinguish a result so painfully attained; that in spite of all appearance the education and discipline of the personal spirit is the aim of creation; and that the author of this system, while He transcends all human excellence, yet bears resemblance to men in two essential points; He must be supreme *goodness* and Love; and He must be supreme *justice*. He must be known as *Creator* of the world, and *Judge* of mankind; indifferent neither to their *happiness* nor their *virtue*: and these in the end are identical.

The Platonist or Gnostic of this period considers all such direct interference with phenomena derogatory to the highest God[1]. Behind the duality of the Powers in their *natural* and

In future, there is no hope of a return to the unreasoning state of happy innocence in Eden or Arcadia.' 'Who would prefer' (he asks, in a burst of enthusiasm, significant enough in 1792) 'the sty to such a glorious and infinite destiny?' Compare also the Lactantian interpolator, D. I. vii. 5.

[1] PSEUDO-PLUTARCH, *Plac. Philos.* I. 6. PLATO'S creationism is rebuked (*ὄζει λήρου Βεκκεσελήνου*); *κοινῶς οὖν ἁμαρτάνουσιν ἀμφότεροι* (Plato and Anaxagoras) *ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν ἐποίησαν ἐπιστρεφόμενον τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἢ καὶ τούτου χάριν τὸν κόσμον κατασκευάζοντα. Τὸ γὰρ μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον ζῶον, συμπεπληρωμένον τε πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ κακοῦ πάντος ἄδεκτον, ὅλον ὂν περὶ τὴν συνοχὴν τῆς ἰδίας εὐδαιμονίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἀνεπιστρεφές ἐστι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων. Κακοδαίμων δ' ἂν εἴη, ἐργάτου δικὴν καὶ τέκτονος, ἀχθοφορῶν καὶ μεριμνῶν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευήν.*

So much for the *physical* development of the world, where the influence of the Highest Deity appeared unimaginable: it was the same in the *historical*; —*πῶς δὲ εἴπερ ὁ Θεὸς ἔστι, καὶ τῇ τούτου φροντίδι τὰ κατ' ἄνθρωπον οἰκονομεῖται, τὸ μὲν κίβδηλον εὐτυχεῖ, τὸ δ' ἀστεῖον τἀναντία πάσχει*; CELSUS does indeed believe in Providence, but it is administered through inferior agents: Condescension of the Supreme Being to man he could not understand. It was an axiom of philosophic religion that all direct communication, *except dimly in*

historical activity, there stands the Philonian λόγος; and even this power is too much qualified and bears too many attributes to be regarded as the ultimate principle; and a *neuter* word, which expresses not so much the conscious *Source* as the indefinite *Ground* of existence, has to be introduced. The later Platonic theology is a continual straining after something still more abstract and completely negative and one, as if determined to put an end to the anthropomorphic superstition of the divine image in Man; and to separate finally the Author from his work, not perhaps by the primitive dualism of the master of the School, but by an ever-increasing series of intermediate beings or stages, which perplexed and discouraged the aspirant to reunion with the only true life. But the

thought (ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, vii. 40, 42) was impossible. 'Man is not formed in God's image (vi. 63–4), nor is he any dearer to God than animals; indeed, many tribes have a far closer affinity (ἐγγυτέρω τῆς θείας ὁμιλίας ἐκεῖνα πεφυκέναι, καὶ εἶναι σοφώτερα καὶ θεοφιλέστερα, iv. 88). It is an absurd superstition to believe that the world was made for us men (iv. 69, 23), or that the highest truth is entrusted to a single nation, or the simplicity of ignorant faith; or, indeed, that there is any absolute and universal religious truth at all.'

The distance between God and the world (which can only be called *His* by a stretch of imagination) he expresses as follows :—Λέγω δὲ οὐδὲν καινόν, ἀλλὰ πάλαι δεδογμένα. Ὁ Θεὸς ἀγαθός ἐστι, καὶ καλὸς καὶ εὐδαίμων, καὶ ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ καὶ ἀρίστῳ. Εἰ δὴ ἐς ἀνθρώπους κάτεισι, μεταβολῆς αὐτῷ δεῖ· μεταβολῆς δὲ ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ εἰς κακὸν . . . . καὶ ἐξ εὐδαιμονίας εἰς κακοδαιμονίαν. Τίς ἂν οὖν ἕλοιτο τοιαύτην μεταβολήν; . . . . οὐκ ἂν οὖν οὐδὲ ταύτην τὴν μεταβολὴν Θεὸς δέχοιτο (iv. 14). By which easy syllogistic method the speculators of the late Hellenic and Imperial age unanswerably refuted the beliefs in Direct Creation, Providence, Revelation; and sent the religious minds to find what solace could be afforded for this neglect, to the mysteries of Isis and Mithra, and the worship of particular and local Daemons. Such a theory tended to support the Roman system, for the Emperor, like the Supreme Deity, was unquestionable and inscrutable, and the pettiness of civic worship (to which CELSUS, no less than LUCIAN and SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, recalled men) prevented any serious coalition in a universal Faith.—Οὔκουν ἀνθρώπῳ πεποίηται τὰ πάντα, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ λέοντι, οὐδ' ἀέτῳ, οὐδὲ δελφῖνι· ἀλλ' ὅπως ὅδε ὁ Κόσμος ὡς ἂν θεοῦ ἔργον . . . . τέλειον ἐξ ἁπάντων γένηται. Τούτου χάριν μεμέτρηται τὰ πάντα, οὐκ ἀλλήλων, εἰ μὴ πάρεργον, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ὅλου· καὶ μέλει τῷ Θεῷ τοῦ ὅλου, καὶ τοῦτο οὔποτε ἀπολείπει Πρόνοια . . . . οὐδὲ διὰ χρόνου πρὸς αὐτὸν (?) ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιστρέφει, οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων ἕνεκα ὀργίζεται (iv. 99). If the Stoics, with EPICTETUS and AURELIUS, have become Platonic in this age, the Platonists have borrowed the Stoic doctrine of a *universal*, not a *particular* Providence.

Christian insists upon this double office of good *Creator* and moral *Judge*, not as the deputed province of some inferior power, but as the essential and inseparable function of the Highest God Himself. 'The Shadow of the Sage's self, projected on vacancy,' was called God; and the Sage had long abandoned interest in the practical life, and expected his Divinity to do the same. But the Christian sees in God a father, and a redeemer, believes in a minute providence never wearied by trifles so called, but overruling all for the best; not some distant being, who takes delight in the Universe as an eternal spectacle, but a consoler ever near to the worshipper, piercing through the outer surroundings to the good-will and honouring and rewarding it alone. Everything else has been stripped off; there is no longer any vain groping amid unrealities, no fruitless pursuit of the object outside all reference to ourselves; but the true life of the world is seen to consist of one relation only, a personal God in immediate contact with personal man.

§ 4. Some such preface on the novelty of the Christian message is required, to throw light on the problem of Evil and its interpretation just at that time. It will be seen that owing to this shifting of the centre of gravity from the Universe to man, an entirely new conception of sin, pain, and evil generally must arise. There is no *end* in creation acknowledged now outside and beyond the perfection of human character; everything must take its place in some subordinate relation to this final aim. This by no means simplifies matters; and the main doctrine of the *personal interest of God in the world*, increases the difficulties which surround the origin and purpose of evil. In that view of the world, (which in future I shall describe for the sake of brevity as the *Impersonal* conception)—the question πόθεν τὰ κακά; is not unanswerable and can be easily eluded by a subtle dialectician. The curiosity of an inquirer who is not yet fully self-conscious, or who has discovered the secret treasure

of his personality only to lose it, may be without difficulty disarmed.

Such pantheistic systems, which make the present and the actual (as a meaningless and infinite series of phenomena), both eternal and divine, must needs eliminate all notion of *purpose* or of *progress*. There can be no history in such a universe. 'Here and now, Deity is perfectly revealed in its two aspects, as thought or as extension.' The inventors of such systems have abandoned all hopes of explanation: they will merely codify existing things, and invent a formula that may satisfy the intellect; and afterwards with more or less poetic sentiment pronounce the result beautiful or detestable, and style the whole, *best* or *worst* of all possible worlds. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away'; the doctrine of the eternity of the universe was seen to be incompatible with Christianity[1]. Nor can the optimist quarrel with the pessimist for imposing his own final construction on

[1] Compare the anti-Platonic writings of AENEAS of GAZA, and ZACHARIAS of MITYLENE. NEMESIUS had for an instant endeavoured to reconcile with Christian faith the two cardinal doctrines of Neo-Platonism, the pre-existence of souls, the eternity of the world; both fatal to the supreme dignity of the Personal.—AENEAS and ZACHARIAS set themselves to disprove them (p. 52, ed. Boissonade) *Theophrastus*: *Οἱ τοῦ Πλάτωνος μυσταγωγοὶ τὸ γέγονεν οὐ γέγονε λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ κατ' αἰτίαν ἐγένετο, οἷον τῆς ἐμῆς σκιᾶς αἴτιον τοὐμὸν σῶμα· ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτὸ πεποίηκεν αὐτήν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνη τούτῳ συνηκολούθησεν.* To which *Euxitheus* replies: *Οὐκ ἄρα δημιουργὸς ὁ Δημιουργὸς εἰ μὴ βουλόμενος ὃ πεποίηκε δημιουργεῖ, ἀλλ' αὐτόματον τόδε τὸ Πᾶν, εἰ μὴ γέγονεν. . . . Οὐκοῦν καὶ τὴν Πρόνοιαν ὁ τῶν ἀνοήτων λόγος συνανεῖλεν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο σκιᾶς ἐπιμέλεια.*—ZACHARIAS, 105, Boiss.: *Φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι, καθάπερ αἴτιον τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἑκάστου σκιᾶς γίνεται, ὁμόχρονος δὲ τῷ σώματι ἡ σκιὰ καὶ οὐχ ὁμότιμος οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὅδε ὁ Κόσμος παρακολούθημά ἐστι τοῦ Θεοῦ, αἰτίου ὄντος αὐτῷ τοῦ εἶναι, καὶ συναΐδιός ἐστι τῷ Θεῷ οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ ὁμότιμος.*—115, Boiss.: *Εἰ δ' ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἐβουλήθη εἶναι τὰ ὄντα, οὐ δεόμενος αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ εἶναι (ἦν γὰρ πρὸ τούτων ὡς τελειότατος καὶ οὐδενὸς δεόμενος, αὐτὸς ὢν ἡ πᾶσα αὐτάρκεια), οὐκ ἄρα ἀνάγκη συναΐδιον εἶναι τῷ πεποιηκότι τὸ ποίημα· δεῖ γὰρ πρεσβύτερον εἶναι τοῦ ποιήματος τὸν ποιητὴν . . . . εἴπερ τὸ ποιούμενον δεύτερόν ἐστι τοῦ ποιοῦντος αἰτίᾳ καὶ χρόνῳ, εἰ μέλλει μὴ ἀβούλητος αἰτία τυγχάνειν καὶ οὐ λελογισμένη (ὥσπερ τῆς σκιᾶς τὸ σῶμα) . . . . Πῶς γὰρ ἂν εἴη δημιουργὸς ὁ Δημιουργὸς εἰ μὴ βουλόμενος ὃ πεποίηκεν εἴη δημιουργός; ἢ εἰ ὥσπερ τῷ σώματι ἡ σκιὰ οὕτως ἁπλῶς καὶ τῷ Δημιουργῷ παρηκολούθησεν ἐκ ταὐτομάτου παρυποστὰν τόδε τὸ Πᾶν;*

the ambiguous results of the scrutiny of things. Both are indeed fully justified; and like all interpretations of this kind each betrays the inmost character of the philosopher; though nominally aiming at *impersonal* truth, each involves an act of moral choice, and proves that the *personal* cannot be silenced[1]: for what is pessimism but the natural reaction of the neglected individual against the eulogies of a Universe, which may be *absolutely* good (whatever possible sense this can have), but is certainly not good in relation to him? In such system then the terms good and bad gradually tend to lose their meaning. They are different manifestations of the same thing; the law of polarity is welcomed by such speculators[2]. In old days, Plato had suggested an explanation by a sort of allegorical hypothesis; God works on a pre-existent matter, and His beneficence is thwarted by the intractable material; or again, original creation is entrusted to inferior deities, and the subsequent care of the world to Daemons. There is no actual and final antithesis of good and evil; no promise of a final triumph of the right, such as might perhaps encourage the Parsee of ancient days; a question perhaps of *stages*, of higher and lower, but not of absolute contraries. The two terms shade off insensibly into each other. There is no clear boundary line of demarcation.

In any case Evil (regarded only in relation to abstractions, to the unconscious, not to the individual who painfully experiences it), tends to disappear, to be considered as non-existent. And this is true, whatever be the precise form of Pantheism in favour.

§ 5. Christianity supplants this *physical* conception of evil by a *moral* explanation. It does not reside as a property in matter, for in its very nature it is inapplicable to anything that is not conscious and free. It can only be understood in

[1] See the very remarkable words of ROMANES, *Thoughts on Religion*, 101–2, 112, 135.

[2] Compare SAMUEL LAING, *A Modern Zoroastrian.*

a *personal* sense. The world no longer flows out from the overfull and brimming cup of God's nature (τὸ ὑπερπλῆρες in PLOTINUS); it is created by Him for a certain and very definite purpose. Evil and matter (so often involved or identified) are no longer the shadow cast by the divine perfection; but the one is His handiwork (and as such *good*, but not *god*); the other is a criminal and deliberate rebellion of a perverse will against His decrees, which are not arbitrary but loving. And on the other side, the ideal set before us is neither the superficial welfare of a nation, nor the progress of civilized humanity, nor even the outward glory of a church, but the education of single souls. As there is nothing that can be called good unreservedly but a 'good will,' so it is impossible to connect the notion of intrinsic Evil with anything but an Evil Will, a person[1].

[1] The methodical Pantheist, who upholds the omnipotence of God at the expense of all other Divine qualities, in vain repeats the unmeaning paradox 'that vice is not less hateful or less deserving of punishment because it is involuntary.' MANILIUS, who as a poet marks the transition of pure Stoic Positivism into a mystic region, and is in a sense the counterpart of Cicero, labours to show the hatefulness of fated evil, and the responsibility of automata: iv. 112:—

'Nam neque mortiferas quisquam magis ederit herbas
Quod non *arbitrio* veniunt, sed *semine certo*;
Gratia nec levior tribuetur dulcibus escis,
Quod *Natura* dedit fruges, non ulla *voluntas*:—
Sic hominum meritis tanto sit gloria maior
Quod caelo gaudente venit; rursusque nocentes
Oderimus magis, in culpam poenasque creatos
(= σκεύη κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν)
Nec refert scelus unde cadat, scelus esse fatendum.

Jonathan Edwards (*Doctrine of Original Sin*, 1758, Boston) is reduced to unintelligible refinement to avoid a logical conclusion:—'The Divine Being is not the author of Sin, but only disposes things in such a manner that Sin will certainly ensue.' No doubt we are right in applying the title Almighty to the Creator, but an exclusive study of this quality of Omnipotence leads us back insensibly to the old discarded *physical* conception of the Divine nature. The highest wonder in the Universe is not the *Power* of God, but His free gift of personality and independence to reasonable creatures. Edwards, too, echoes the Doctrine of MANILIUS in the following opinion:—'The essence of Virtue and Vice, as they exist in the disposition of the Heart, and are manifested in the acts of the Will, lies not in their *cause* but in their *Nature*' (*Freedom of*

Other so-called evils are only *apparent* or *relative* Evils, or blessings in disguise [1]; other imperfections or errors may be due to ignorance or incomplete knowledge—all such belong to time, and are curable; but a fully-conscious and deliberately perverse will must be regarded as eternal in the sense of rejecting its own remedy; for God (this is a valuable lesson which Plato taught) acts on the soul as on the world, not by *compulsion*, but by *persuasion*.

This may perhaps explain how it is that to the Personalist, the idea of an Evil Spirit, who in a sense *thwarts* and in another *fulfils* the designs of Providence is by no means an obsolete superstition, but a doctrine of the highest truth and importance.

§ 6. A second point remains to be considered; in what does personality consist? It is discovered to be the final and unalterable fact of experience [2] (for even Natural Science does not discover things in themselves, but only expresses

the Will, Boston, 1754). 'The possession of the sinful disposition by which men are unable to obey the commands of God is itself their worst and most inexcusable sin' (Letter to Mr. Erskine).

Yet it must not be supposed that Edwards maintained throughout the same implacable resentment against the just claims of the personal. In a posthumous work (*God's Last End in Creation*, Boston, 1788), he contends rightly enough 'that there is no incompatibility between the *happiness* of created beings and the declarative glory of God, inasmuch as these two ends coincide in one. The Creation as happy and holy, as it is the object of the benevolent love of the Creator, cannot but declare His glory.' In a similar manner, the seeming austerity of Kant's *Law of Duty* is softened by a firm conviction or, rather, fervent hope and trust, that Virtue and Happiness are in their nature inseparable, or at least will in the end coincide. 'We are bound to seek to further that harmony between Virtue which is the Highest Good (*Supremum Bonum*) and Happiness, which is the indispensable condition of the realization of Perfect Good (S. Bonum in the sense of *Bonum* Consummatum).' Nay, on this he founds the chief reason for the existence of God; 'we must postulate the existence of a cause, which shall be able to effect the exact degree of agreement of Happiness with Morality; = we must postulate the existence of God.'

[1] We may here fully endorse the language of CELSUS, who tersely sums up the conclusions of Stoic and Platonic thought (in this age hardly distinguishable currents): iv. 70: *Κἄν σοί τι δοκῇ κακόν, οὔπω δῆλον εἰ κακόν ἐστιν· οὐ γὰρ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ἢ σοι ἢ ἄλλῳ ἢ τῷ Ὅλῳ συμφέρει.*

[2] Compare ROMANES, l. c. 130, § 10.

their relations to us, in terms of ourselves). But what is its nature? The essence of Personality rightly conceived is self-limitation. *Creation is the voluntary limitation which God has imposed on Himself.* And creation in this new view (which refuses to work up to self-consciousness, but insists on beginning from it) can only be regarded as a creation of free spirits[1]. Any other conception of the act is more or less inconceivable. We cannot escape from ourselves; and from a sense of responsible worth. The notion of free-will may be 'an inevitable illusion,' but the emphasis is on the first word of the definition, and an illusion is often truer for us than truth itself[2]. Regarding then man, one by one rather than in the aggregate, as the final end of creation (and in a sense perhaps the beginning also), we must hold to our belief in spite of the taunts levelled at our mistaken notion of our value[3]. Now since the Personalist must regard creation as a deliberate and moral act (not as a necessary outflowing of unconscious perfection), *it is clear that omnipotence, in the usual sense of the word, can no longer form one of the* primary *attributes of the Divine Nature.* It is a truer form of almighty power to submit to limitation; and this the Christian believes to be the main doctrine of his faith. God limits Himself in time, He sacrifices Himself in submitting to the bonds of matter; not as if this self-emptying were an eternal process, but as a means to some great and benevolent end; the communication of His own nature to free beings. God, if I may reverently use the expression, submits, not indeed to a development, but to a circumscription, in history. He pleads with man, and while He seems to educate the race, is acting for the sake of the single life. The Son of God to complete our redemption, does not

[1] Compare LOTZE'S *Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion.*

[2] Lord Kames opined that 'God had deceived mankind by an invincible instinct or feeling, which leads them to suppose that they are free.'

[3] Compare LEOPARDI'S *Dialogue 'of the Goblin and the Gnome.'*

shrink from suffering and death, that henceforward a man may say, not only 'Our Father,' but 'My Saviour.'

In sum, the visible world in Christianity is not the expression of God, but His self-limitation (in a sense also, His disguise); and the course of history represents the rejection of the Almighty, and the sufferings of the Lord of Glory.

PART II.

GOD (CREATOR AND JUDGE) AND THE ORIGIN OF EVIL.

§ 1. Nothing need now detain us from the promised consideration of two remarkable writers in the Ante-Nicene period, the author of the Pseudo-CLEMENTINE literature [1], and LACTANTIUS [2]. We have seen the tendency of orthodox

[1] The CLEMENTINE literature: works written probably in Syria towards the middle or close of the second century, and claiming CLEMENT of Rome for their author: earliest form no doubt the most violent, polemical, and doctrinal (Ebionitic); owing to the interest of the narrative (in which CLEMENT starts from Rome to hear Christ, falls in with Peter, and at last discovers his parent, after witnessing all Peter's conflicts with Simon Magus), these writings secured the sympathy of the orthodox, and the *Homilies* were corrected and altered, so as to remove points of difference, and concentrate attention on the romance and its incidents. *The Recognitions* is the name given to RUFFINUS's translation of the original work, in which he boldly exercises his well-known power of excision and modification. The stages of this process of adaptation to orthodox readers very possibly were: (1) the early and now lost *Archetype*, where doctrinal hostility had the chief place; (2) *Homilies*, which we have in Greek, in which story and polemic have an equal share; (3) RUFFINUS's translation, or the *Recognitions*, where dogma is becoming subordinate; (4) the *Epitome*, where the story as such monopolizes all attention, and the sermons and debates have fallen out. The general teaching of the Clementines will be seen from the quotations which follow.

[2] L. CAELIUS FIRMIANUS (circ. 260–340 A.D.), a contemporary of the Neo-Platonist Iamblichus; a pupil of ARNOBIUS the Numidian, but not an imitator of his style; professed rhetoric at Nicomedia between the years 305–312 A.D. (*Div. Inst.* v. 2); 'in extreme old age,' as Jerome tells us, was the tutor of Crispus, the son of Constantine I, in Gaul, 319 A.D. He wrote (1) seven books of *Divine Instructions*, on the model of his master's work, in which he contrasts the true religion with vain superstition on the one hand, and proud philosophy on the other; (2) *De Opificio Dei*, to Demetrianus;

Christianity to emphasize the personal element in God (that is, His self-limitation), and the personal element in man, his accountability, and therefore his freedom. The one hypothesis seems to explain the title *Creator*, the second the function of *Judge*, both of which meet us at every turn in the Anti-Gnostical writings. There is thus both *purpose* and *progress* in the world: and the definite goal to which creation moves is the judgement of man, rational and responsible. It is never pretended that this conception of the world explains the existence of evil adequately; the believer can only say, 'Free-will, with which we start as a postulate, is inconceivable without the possibility of lapse; and the results of perseverance in a particular course may become a permanent and ineffaceable habit. God might have created blameless puppets, but while we are constituted as we are, it is impossible to sincerely attach to such creatures a notion of merit; just as it is impossible with justice to punish ignorance save with a view to its correction. God might indeed have foreseen and prevented the fall of angels and men; but as He has, though foreseeing, not prevented, we can only suppose that in a mysterious manner evil, which apparently baffles the purpose of God in the world, is made (in a still more comprehensive monistic doctrine) to serve His eternal end; the probation, redemption, and eternal happiness of Free Spirits.'

It is at this point precisely that we are met by the greatest obstacle. Is the evil spirit *independent* then of God, or is he still His *servant*? a *rival*, or a *minister*? There can be no doubt that these two notions coincide in the Christian

(3) the *Epitome* of the *Div. Instit.* to Pentadius; (4) *On the Anger of God*, against the Epicureans, to Donatus; (5) the work *On the Death of Persecutors* may or may not be his (it is headed 'Lucius Caecilius,' and dedicated to Donatus): an interesting historical account in accurate style of the fate of persecuting emperors, especially at the beginning of the fourth century. His Latinity has been all the more admired since his orthodoxy has been impeached. Jerome, *Ep.* 58: 'Utinam tam nostra affirmare potuisset, quam facile aliena destruxit!'

doctrine of the Devil, which, as contrasted with Gnostic or Manichaean speculation, never attributes to him original coexistence with God, but a *created* life in time; yet sometimes seems to convey the idea of successful opposition to divine counsels. One object of the Pseudo-CLEMENTINES is without doubt to investigate the nature of Evil, and its place in a universe which was created by a moral Being, just and merciful, and which cannot be regarded as the abortion of an inferior divinity. We find in them a crude yet working hypothesis to account for this; and there is a distinct point of contact with LACTANTIUS in the dogma of Syzygies (ὁ κανὼν τῆς Συζυγίας). The first impulse of the writer of the *Homilies*, which I take to be the earlier unmodified form, is to refute a certain form of Gnôsis, and to point to the true remedy for such heresies, in a resolute excision of scriptural interpolations, which arise from a perverted Judaism. This religion (whose historical fortress the various forces of Gnosticism beleaguered) must be restated as a *spiritual*, not a *ceremonious* faith. In fact, one form of Gnôsis is employed to combat another: a modified Marcionitism is to correct, without breaking from, the Old Testament; and the writer aims at discovering the original primitive religion, identical in the true Jew and the true Christian, and now for the first time thrown open to the whole Gentile world. There is a certain honesty in this method of dealing with inconvenient Scripture; allegory is not tolerated in this severe school: 'ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur.' What is unworthy of God is interpolated; and the power of discriminating genuine from false has come with the advent of the True Prophet. 'But how is it that God's word has been allowed to suffer this violation?' The answer is significant of the whole mental attitude of the writer; 'to *test* the perspicacity of the reader, and prove if a *natural instinct* of what is right and wrong, suitable and in-apt for the Divine Being, could escape slavery to a written letter'; in a word,

to encourage personal inquiry, led indeed by a sense of right (*τὸ εὔλογον*), and to dignify beyond an inspired book the free and innate knowledge of God, which every man possesses.

§ 2. The God revealed by this eternal religion is before all things personal, Creator, Governor, Judge. There is no original antithesis of co-ordinate principles; nor any scheme of higher and lower spheres which ends in pagan Gnosticism by dissociating the idea of Creation and Providence from the Supreme God. The world is built for man's sake; and, for his further discipline, for his education into self-knowledge and self-reliance, a duality of influences, evil and good, are called into play, from Cain and Abel down to Simon Magus and Peter, culminating in the final appearance of Antichrist and Christ. The evil in the world is explained partly as the will of the Supreme, partly as the necessary probation of man. Sometimes, with a certain inconsistency it is stated that *ἡ Κακία* (personified evil) sends out her apostles, and again Greek *παιδεία* all comes from *ὁ Κακὸς Δαίμων*, while references to evil angels are not uncommon. The True Prophet, who in each emission of pairs appears in the *second* place, is God's spirit, again and again in successive incarnations entering a rebellious world, clothing itself in human flesh, or united to some good man, and on each occasion teaching the same truth: namely, the doctrine of God, *Creator* and *Judge*, the sum, as it were, of Natural Religion, or Exoteric Christianity, in Irenaeus and Origen;—a stern yet necessary doctrine in an age when the idea of God evaporated in a vague conception of an impassive Benevolence at the root of things, and the freedom and responsibility of man in a determinist 'physical advantage' (*φύσεως προτέρημα*) of a small minority selected by a non-moral choice. These several Theophanies calling man to true knowledge, and to the hope of a future life, are invariably thwarted, and indeed anticipated, by a corresponding emanation of evil. Such is the main outline of this curious attempt at speculative com-

promise, the union of true Hebraism and Christianity as the proclamation of one God, Creator and Judge; the refutation of non-ethical Gnôsis and ceremonial Judaism by cutting away all inconvenient scriptural testimony; and the explanation of the obvious struggle of good and evil influences in this world by a (somewhat ambiguous) subordination of Evil to the final purpose of God. *Ethical* as the writer tries to be, a dangerous *physical* interpretation is in the last resort placed upon evil; for both good and evil seem to be the manifestations of an indifferent being in polarity, a sort of counterpart to the strange notions of bifurcation in the original unisexual ADAM KADMON. But, though strict logic may at times seem to drive him to this position, it is nevertheless alien to the general tenor of these writings; for, however fantastic this cosmogony may be, the basis of all such theorizing is an honest conviction of a *moral purpose* in the world as far as its Creator's intention is concerned; and of the moral dignity of man, which by free choice can realize, can co-operate in this purpose. We have before us an ingenious attempt to preserve the unity, goodness, transcendence of God, and His impassibility (*ἀπροσπάθεια*), without at the same time giving the world over entirely to the rule of the Devil, or on the other hand explaining away the significance and existence of evil. The author acknowledges evil as the wilful rebellion of a free-will; but believes that it subserves God's intention. He is thus working on the side of orthodoxy as champion of *personality*. What is his object in Books v, vi, vii? To repudiate current paganism, whether *popular* or *esoteric*; to expose the crimes of mythology, or their seductive allegorization. At the mouth of Appion, a hypocritical priest of a religion of Reserve, we have a strange cosmogony from Chaos, in which Ἔρως, a blind struggle of an unconscious life-principle, takes the place of a purposeful Creator. It is just this [modern] principle of the 'strivings of the Will to live' which excites the hostility of the writer. He feels the inconsistency of

a material and unconscious substrate of infinite potentiality [1]. He seems to object to the sudden and uncalled-for intrusion of a 'deus ex machina,' ὁ αἰθέριος τεχνιτής, into a universe, which appears (according to this hypothesis) to have grown up very well by itself. At the beginning of things, he is determined to have a *personal* Mind, and thus in these books strikes a blow at Hylozoism (or the belief that the egg is first), that mysterious and inconceivable doctrine, which we can reconcile neither with our experience nor our reason, but which nevertheless is, and always has been, the fundamental creed of the larger part of mankind, though it be sometimes disguised by personal names and *personified* impulse as in mythology, or as in the Aristotelian metaphor of the yearning (ὄρεξις) of matter after form.

§ 3. On this point we can at least be clear: God is a personal will, absolute, and almighty, whose purpose nothing can oppose: He is by no means formless, but ἔχων μορφήν: else ἐν τίνι ἐρείσῃ [2]; He is not infinite space, but rather the heart of the universe. Next, the world is created for man, by the grace and gift of God, himself a free person; and to set before his choice two kingdoms of *transient* and *eternal* good, two spirits (or influences) are produced. Here then is Man placed for probation between two rival chieftains, tried by interpolated Scriptures, wiles of Daemons, and inherited passions and diseases, and, above all, held in fetters of Πλάνη and Συνήθεια, the hateful antagonist of Ἀλήθεια. The True Prophet comes to restore the primitive Monotheism of the patriarchs, handed down from the saintly and unfallen Adam (who is his earliest incarnation); and to revive pure spiritual Hebraism free from fiery sacrifices, and purified by the new watery birth (for on Baptism and its efficacy the writer especially insists). It is a religion of gratitude to the *Creator*,

[1] Compare Dr. H. Stirling, who shows that this is actually Idealism, in his *Secret of Hegel*.

[2] Compare the complaint of the Egyptian monk in Socrates.

fear of the *Judge*. This visible world is indeed the *creation* of God, with its present pleasures and allurements; but there is a greater stress on His moral government (PHILO's βασιλικὴ δύναμις), which places us in these enticing surroundings, not that we may enjoy them, but of deliberate choice (a self-limitation) 'may pass through things temporal' to God himself, and our better home. Very significant of 'CLEMENT's' emphasis on the *personal* is his distinct rejection of a *Magical* theory of *revelation* or *redemption*, in which divine truth or divine life is appropriated by the entire abandonment or annihilation of the human (which yet must be postulated as the centre and agent of the appropriation). Revelation for man thus placed must come from within, the echo in the heart of God's voice without. External means of information may be fraudulent (scriptures and visions). As opposed to the mechanical and arbitrary theory of inspiration in Philo and in the Apologists (in which the Sun of human reason sets before the dark radiance of the divine night can reign [1]), all heavenly secrets or messages are judged by τὸ εὔλογον, the instinctive and moral sense which each man of birthright possesses, that God is *good* and *just*. It is the canon of *rational probability* [2], III. 31, 32. The opposite view may in a measure be regarded as a corollary of that docetic theophany in which Christ passes through the Virgin, ὥσπερ διὰ σωλῆνος. The divine and the human are incompatible, and, save for an instantaneous moment of miracle, mutually exclude each other. There is no real union of God and man; for the conception of both is still *physical*, infinite and finite, and not *moral*; the supposed reconciliation is of two antithetic *natures*, not the harmony of two free and personal *Wills*.

But to 'CLEMENT' the *appropriation* of one personal will by another must be real and not fictitious. Christ speaks clearly;

[1] Compare PHILO's Commentary on Gen. xv. 12: *Rer. Div. Her.* 53.

[2] Which to-day would seem to be ousting the old *à priori* arguments against the possibility of a Divine Revelation.

all, even the most ignorant, can understand; for the True Prophet offers Himself to each man, just as each can receive Him. The human side is not merged in the divine; but remains entire, though transformed to co-operate of free choice, and to enjoy the consciousness of working with God. [But whatever merits the writer of the CLEMENTINE *Homilies* may be justly allowed[1], all are rendered valueless by his imperfect Christology. There is no true reconciliation; and in the end, the justice of God becomes unethical, and the appearance of Christ a transient theophany. Yet, as it is not with the doctrine of Christ's Person that I am now concerned, but with the Prince of the Left, the above commendation may be allowed to hold good in this latter relation.]

§ 4. In the doctrine of Evil (founded upon this *moral* view of the person of God and man) an attempt is made to infuse an *ethical* significance into a *physical* and necessitarian conception of the Divine Nature and the world-process. The Supreme Being, possibly in perverted Rabbinism, and certainly in many Gnostic sects, is regarded as bisexual, hermaphroditic; as containing, that is, within Himself, a lower element, destined to issue in a more or less fictitious conflict; 'that in God, which is not yet God,' to borrow an idea which is found in BEHMEN, and lies at the root of much transcendental cosmogony, in the earlier years of this century. Without forsaking this hypothesis (an immediate expression in polarity, by contraries), our writer,—determined opponent of impersonalism, and starting from an assumption of fully-conscious and purposeful reason,—transforms the idea of evil from a necessary development of a certain side in the Divine Nature (inconceivable when so much importance was attached to the *simplicity* of τὸ ὄν) into a deliberate creation, designed for the *moral* discipline of man. With much honesty of purpose, and boldness of enterprise, the writer cannot come to a satisfactory or con-

[1] Compare the remarks of Mr. Simon, note YYY. Div. I, vol. i. of DORNER'S work, Clark's Translation.

sistent conclusion. For with the best wishes he has not brought out the real *ethical* conception of sin, and there remains in the picture of the world-spirit a *physical* notion which in the end either throws back the entire guilt upon the Creator (so-called *Augustinian*), or, regarding evil as necessary to development and moral choice, denies its essential evilness altogether (*Platonist*).

In the citations it will be seen how the old problem occurs (at last to be dismissed as insoluble),—the problem which we have thus stated: Is the Devil a *rival* or a *servant* of God? The former is the conception most in favour with Personalists, inasmuch as wilful defiance of a good law by a free being is the only intelligible kind of evil. But in the difficulty of this mode of thought, the author takes refuge in a physical notion; the devil was 'created to rejoice at the punishment of the bad,' and to find pleasure in a certain habitation, where such punishment was to be exercised; and in this latter case he is blameless, for his constitution, as agent of a lower province, the divine displeasure and justice, is *naturally* or of *necessity* such as God made him; while on occasion, by an omission which cannot be otherwise described than as shifty and inexcusable, he is spoken of as 'created to rejoice in evil,' and not in its punishment. 'The evil principle' (says DORNER's commentator) 'serves (the Good) without either knowing or willing to do so; for though Satan *himself* is not righteous as God is, his *work* is righteous. When he does mischief, he is executing a divine punishment, which God as the Good cannot *Himself* directly administer.' Accordingly, he is compelled, without being aware of it, 'to help on the victory of the righteous God.' But whatever the strict definition of the Devil's freedom or responsibility for the part he plays, to him as to a supreme world-spirit is entrusted visible creation; he is the lord of the kingdom of transient good things. It is not an usurpation so much as a lawful commission or delegation of authority. He rules over pagan ideas of present enjoyment

and brief pleasures; in a word, over a life of secular and finite hopes, in which the true value of the *personal* spirit is sacrificed. Christ is the king of the world to come, of the eternal hopes of the true self-realization, only accomplished by self-restriction in this lower sphere. The future glory cannot be gained save by abandonment of present attractions: even the beauty of the world is a snare, and the dominant idea of morality is asceticism. Enjoyment of the one is incompatible with attainment of the other ('and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented'). There are then two classes in this Subordinate Dualism: the secularists, who seek impatiently to gratify what they falsely believe to be their true personality, untrusting in a divine purpose in things, extending beyond the visible; and the citizens of the City of Truth, an inheritance won by patient waiting and a resolute sacrifice, not indeed of self, but of the lower instincts, which we must learn to discard, selling all for the one pearl of great price[1]. And these two classes arise by no summary fiat of a divine separation, but by free choice, exercised with full chances in a world of opposites.

PART III.

CITATIONS FROM THE CLEMENTINE HOMILIES.

II. 15. God in His own Nature is one, but His manifestation is twofold, and by means of opposites: *Εἷς ὢν αὐτὸς διχῶς καὶ ἐναντίως διεῖλε πάντα τὰ τῶν ἄκρων.* The same notion differently expressed, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτὸς εἷς ὢν καὶ μόνος θεὸς ποιήσας οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν, ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα . . . ζωὴν καὶ θάνατον.* In the midst of this world of contraries man is placed to exercise free choice on things *already* good and bad (but only

[1] Manilius IV. 404:—

Quid caelo dabimus? quantum est, quo veneat omne?
Impendendus homo est, Deus esse ut possit in ipso.

relatively to him): ᾧ καὶ τὰς τῶν συζυγιῶν ἐνήλλαξεν εἰκόνας. The *present* world is, as it were, the lesser mystery (τὰ μικρά); it is πρόσκαιρος and is full of ἄγνοια; it is θῆλυς and bears children, not for itself but for eternity. The future world is τὰ μείζω, ἀΐδιος, γνῶσις, and ὡς πατὴρ ἀποδεχόμενος its offspring now grown to maturity, from the hands of this age, a mother or a nurse, to whom the early care, but not the complete education, is entrusted. 16. Ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ Θεὸς εἷς ὤν, ὥσπερ δεξιὰ καὶ ἀριστερά, πρῶτον ἐποίησε τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶτα τὴν γῆν καὶ οὕτως ἑξῆς πάσας τὰς συζυγίας. But in the case of man he *alters* the *order* of this manifestation in pairs. In this way the author marks the difference of man from other creatures (μόνος αὐτεξούσιος) and of the development in History from that of Nature. ἐπὶ μέντοι ἀνθρώπων οὐκέτι οὕτως ἀλλὰ πάσας ἐναλλάττει τὰς συζυγίας. ὡς γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὰ πρῶτα κρείττονα, τὰ δεύτερα ἥττονα (here is a doctrine at the root of all Gnostic Emanationism), ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων τὸ ἐνάντιον εὑρίσκομεν, τὰ πρῶτα χείρονα, τὰ δεύτερα κρείττονα. It is probable that *physical* excellence gives its best first; but the idea of gradual progress seems inseparable from the idea of *moral* perfection. The rejection of evil implies the possibility of yielding to its enticements; and in a measure even this yielding is a necessary moment in an upward course. But it is in vain that we look for steady consistency; 33. *two* new discrepancies arise: ἡ Κακία appears as a personal power, rival of God; and the antecedence of good in physical creation seems abandoned: ἐπεὶ γάρ, ὡς ἔφαμεν, δυϊκῶς καὶ ἐναντίως πάντα ἔχοντα ὁρῶμεν, first Night then Day (but see above), first ignorance then knowledge, first disease then healing,—so πρῶτα τὰ τῆς Πλάνης τῷ βίῳ ἔρχεται, and then Truth, first the diseases by Aaron's rod, then the cure by Moses; (and at this juncture in the struggle of the world), as the pagans are turning from their idols, so ἡ Κακία πάλιν ὡς αὐτὴ βασιλεύουσα anticipates their conversion, and sends forth her guileful favourite, Simon. So III. 59. Προλαβοῦσα ἡ Κακία τῷ τῆς συζυγίας νόμῳ προ-

ἀπέστειλε Σίμωνα, to make man believe in many gods, instead of one Creator of the world. So VII. 11 of Simon: *αὐτὸς ἐστὶ Μαγός, αὐτὸς διάβολος, αὐτὸς Κακίας ὑπηρέτης.* (As to this mysterious prosopopoeia, is it not possible that the writer, struggling with a *moral* conception of sin expressed in language which often reduces it to an original and therefore *physical* distinction, intended by *ἡ Κακία*, the feminine principle of weakness in created things, aspiring blindly to a fuller participation in its Creator, or, to put it from the Platonic and impersonal point of view, the visible and transient world, striving by ceaseless reproduction of types to appropriate the perfection of the intellectual region—*τὰ νοητά*? But the theologian must make up his mind whether he will consider this weakness which thwarts, a *defiance* of the Creator's designs, or a *conscious infirmity* which seeks to heal itself. On the answer will depend the entire conception of sin as *physical* or *moral;* and also the notion of God, as interested Creator or impersonal reservoir of goodness. Is Matter to blame for its defects? PLATO inclines to the belief that it is; ARISTOTLE defends it by the new doctrine of the 'yearnings' of inanimate nature (a notion which, though an indefensible personification, lies behind much Pantheistic speculation, notably that of M. VACHEROT). But all this inconsistency merely proves the futility of the Manichean *physical* hypothesis, and its extreme superficiality.)

III. 33. The duplicity of the universe is represented here in a purely *physical* light. God, who creates the world and disposes the elements, makes the pleasure of existence (and perhaps also its duration) to depend upon the law of interaction and alternation. It was perhaps impossible to conceive of the continuance of creation, save under the idea of a perpetual overcoming of an opposite in a new unity: *Οὗτος μόνος τὴν μίαν καὶ πρώτην μονοειδῆ οὐσίαν τετραχῶς καὶ ἐναντίως ἔτρεψεν· εἶτα μίξας, κράσεις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα εἰς ἐναντίας φύσεις*

τετραμμέναι καὶ μεμιγμέναι τοῦ ζῆν ἡδονὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀντισυζυγίας ἐργάσωνται. There is a trace here of a fatal tendency to transform bad and good in man into a mere *physical* distinction of sex in common with earlier speculators; and in this semi-Platonic passage, which recalls both the Symposium and the Timaeus, there is a postulate of Matter coexisting with God which is not explained satisfactorily either here or elsewhere in the *Homilies*.

But from such *metaphysical* or *physical* ideas the writer hastens back to his *personal* relations, the notion of the Two Kingdoms of Darkness and Light, between which man is placed: XV. 7. *ὁ τῆς Ἀληθείας παρὼν προφήτης ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς, ὅτι ὁ τῶν ὅλων Δημιουργὸς καὶ Θεός, δυσί τισιν ἀπένειμε βασιλείας δύο, Ἀγαθῷ τε καὶ Πονηρῷ, δοὺς τῷ μὲν Κακῷ τοῦ παρόντος κόσμου μετὰ νόμον τὴν βασιλείαν, ὥστ' ἂν ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν κολάζειν τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας. Τῷ δὲ Ἀγαθῷ τὸν ἐσόμενον ἀΐδιον αἰῶνα.* In § 6 we have a kind of apologue of these two kingdoms, as of *δύο ἐχθρῶν βασιλέων ὄντων καὶ διῃρημένας τὰς χώρας ἐχόντων.* Men are defrauders of their true sovereign, so as to live in a foe's land (*καθὸ ἐν ἑτέρου εἰσὶ βασιλείᾳ*), but God is kind and pardons them. XX. 2. *ὁ Θεὸς δύο βασιλείας ὁρίσας καὶ δύο αἰῶνας συνεστήσατο, κρίνας τῷ Πονηρῷ δέδοσθαι τὸν παρόντα κόσμον διὰ τὸ μικρόν τε αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ παρέρχεσθαι ὀξέως, τῷ δὲ Ἀγαθῷ σώσειν ὑπέσχετο τὸν μέλλοντα αἰῶνα, ἅτε δὴ μέγαν ὄντα καὶ ἀΐδιον.* Between these man is absolutely free to choose: *Τὸν οὖν ἄνθρωπον αὐτεξούσιον ἐποίησεν, ἐπιτηδειότητα ἔχοντα νεύειν πρὸς ἃς βούλεται πράξεις . . . ὡς εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ φυραμάτων δύο, θηλείας τε καὶ ἄρρενος*; and thus, XIX. 23. *ὁ κόσμος ὄργανόν ἐστι τεχνικῶς γεγονός, ἵνα τῷ ἐσομένῳ ἄρρενι αἰωνίως ἡ θήλεια τίκτῃ δικαίους αἰωνίους υἱούς.* XX. 2. cont.: *Διὸ δὴ καὶ δύο ὁδοὶ προετέθησαν, νόμου τε καὶ ἀνομίας· δύο τε βασιλεῖαι ὡρίσθησαν, ἡ μὲν οὐρανῶν λεγομένων, ἡ δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς νῦν βασιλευόντων. Ἀλλὰ καὶ δύο βασιλεῖς ἐτάχθησαν, ὧν ὁ μὲν τοῦ παρόντος καὶ προσκαίρου κόσμου νόμῳ βασιλεύειν ἐχειροτονήθη . . . ὁ δὲ ἕτερος καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ὑπάρχων τοῦ*

ἐσομένου αἰῶνος, στέργει πᾶσαν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν ἐν τοῖς παροῦσι τὴν παρρησίαν ἔχειν οὐ δυνάμενος ἀλλ' ὥς τίς πότ' ἐστι λανθάνειν πειρώμενος τὰ συμφέροντα συμβουλεύει. (Now it is evident that this writing is an attempt to escape from Gnosticism by the employment of Gnostic resource. With a strong insistence on God as the good Creator of the visible world, a defence indeed of the Creator from the attacks of the prevailing Discontent, the practical ethics amount to a completely Manichean and ascetic repudiation of this life: and, in this passage of Peter's esoteric teaching, this strange Gnostic position is adopted, so strenuously attacked by the orthodox writers, that Christ comes secretly to win men away by stealth from their allegiance. Our legitimate ruler and sovereign is the Devil, or rather this world belongs to him. Does it not appear an infringement of the original partition of Time and Eternity (the temporal and the immortal life), if the Saviour robs the Devil of his subjects before their period of servitude is over?) III. 19. Christ suffered and died here: *μέλλοντος αἰῶνος βασιλεὺς εἶναι κατηξιωμένος πρὸς τὸν νῦν ἐμπροθέσμως παρειλήφοτα νόμῳ τὴν βασιλείαν [τὴν μαχὴν ἐποιεῖτο ?]*

Each man is free to choose his leader: *ἑαυτὸν* (XV. 7) *ἀπονέμειν ᾧ βούλεται ἢ τῷ παρόντι Κακῷ ἢ τῷ μέλλοντι 'Αγαθῷ.* Those who choose the *present* good are richly dowered here (*πλουτεῖν τρυφᾶν ἥδεσθαι· τῶν γὰρ ἐσομένων ἀγαθῶν οὐδὲν ἕξουσι*). But those who choose the delights of the future kingdom (*τὰ τῆς μελλούσης βασιλείας*) . . . *τὰ ἐνταῦθα ὡς ἀλλοτρίου βασιλέως ἴδια ὄντα, αὐτοῖς νομίζεσθαι οὐκ ἔξεστιν, ἢ ὕδατος μόνου καὶ ἄρτου καὶ τούτων μεθ' ἱδρῶτος πορις̓ομένων πρὸς τὸ ζῆν, καὶ περιβολαίου ἑνός.* As in the system of Lactantius, there is no place in the kingdom of God for the wealthy and successful in this life; good fortune here (supposed to be in each case a deliberate choice) disqualifies for eternal bliss: the two spheres are incompatible; and no one can 'make the best of both worlds.'

Daemons have power only over those who yield to their

allurements and eat at their table, VII. 3: *Οὕτω γὰρ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντα κτισάντος Θεοῦ, δυσὶν ἑκάστοτε ἄρχουσι δεξιῷ τε καὶ εὐωνύμῳ ὡρίσθη νόμος μὴ ἔχειν ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐξουσίαν ἐὰν μὴ πρότερόν τινι ὁμοτράπεζος γένηται, ὃν εὖ ποιῆσαι ἢ κακῶσαι βούλεται.* And as the fires of Judaic sacrifice are extinguished by the water of Baptism, so the table of Devils (*εἰδωλόθυτα*) is superseded by the Eucharist. VIII. 21. Christ the king of the future world was exposed to the same temptation, the display of the glories or pleasures, which this life and its prince have to offer: *τῷ γὰρ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἡμῶν βασιλεῖ προσῆλθέ ποτε ὁ πρόσκαιρος βασιλεύς, καὶ οὐ βίαν ποιῶν (οὐ γὰρ ἐξῆν) ἀλλὰ προτρέπων καὶ ἀναπείθων (ὅτι τὸ πεισθῆναι ἐπὶ τῇ ἑκάστου κεῖται ἐξουσίᾳ).* Christ refuses, knowing this voluntary choice of the temporal means eternal servitude to the Devil. XX. 3. These two beings ever fight together for the possession of Man's allegiance: *τῶν δὲ δύο τούτων ὁ ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον ἐκβιάζεται Θεοῦ κελεύσαντος*, and each of us has perfect freedom to obey which he prefers. If the Good, he becomes *κτῆμα* of the future sovereign, whose kingdom is not from hence; if the Evil, *τοῦ παρόντος γίνεται Πονηροῦ ὑπηρέτημα.* Notice the *neuters:* it is suggested that the first effort of deliberate will is alone *free;* afterwards we must abide by the consequence; 'we are not our own.' And remembering the practical problem of that age, the question of the Realm of Freedom, we may see here that *κτῆμα* implies no real sacrifice of self, but only a voluntary mancipation to a service which is 'perfect freedom,' in which the *personality* is invigorated, not extinguished.

The so-called gifts of Fortune then come from the Devil, who, as in the old German legends, makes a compact with the soul, and barters a fixed period of earthly success for an eternal slavery. But occasionally (and as a result of an inconsistency to which I must again refer) the Devil is represented as punishing his subjects even in this life, *ὃς* (XX. 3) *δι' ἁμαρτίας κρίσει δικαίᾳ τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ λαβὼν ἐξουσίαν, καὶ πρὸ*

τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος θελήσας αὐτῇ χρῆσθαι, ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ κολάζων ἥδεται: in which simple sentence lies the whole problem of the alternative, *rebel* or *minister?* and the entire confusion in this writer's mind between indignation at evil and rejoicing in it.

This strife of the two kings, present and to come, constitutes the world-process, or at least the historic development of mankind. Adam is the first manifestation of the good principle, and it is an error to suppose that he fell: III. 22. *πλὴν τούτῳ σύζυγος συνεκτίσθη θήλεια φύσις*, as inferior to him as *μετουσία* to *οὐσία*, as moon to sun, as fire to light. This wife of Adam, who almost approaches the traditionary conception of Lilith, is believed to be *πρώτη προφῆτις, τοῦ νῦν κόσμου ὡς θήλεια ὁμοίου ἄρχουσα*. II. 16. From Adam there arose, first *ἄδικος Καΐν*, second *δίκαιος Ἀβέλ*, according to the law of Emanation (*ὁ λόγος*, or *ὁ κανὼν τῆς συζυγίας*, or (III. 23) *κατὰ τὸν τῆς προόδου λόγον*, and *ἐν τῇ τῶν συζυγιῶν προελεύσει*). Symbolical of this great secret, now at last revealed, is the emission of the birds from Noah's ark. II. 16. cont.: *πνευμάτων εἰκόνες δύο ἀπεστάλησαν ἀκαθαρτοῦ λέγω καὶ καθαροῦ*, first the black raven, then the white dove. We have the pairs: Ishmael, Isaac; Esau, Jacob; Aaron (*τῇ τάξει πρῶτος . . . ὁ ἀρχιερεύς· εἶτα ὁ νομοθέτης*), Moses. The last pair that preceded Simon Magus and Peter were Jesus and John the Baptist (II. 17, III. 22), last representative of the female principle: *ὁ ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν πρῶτος ἦλθεν, εἶτα ὁ ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων*. So II. 23, of John: *ὃς καὶ τοῦ κυρίου . . . κατὰ τὸν τῆς συζυγίας λόγον ἐγένετο πρόοδος*. In like manner the Magus precedes Peter: II. 17. *ὁ πρὸ ἐμοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτος ἐλθών* (repeated III. 59). 'It is easy to detect whose he is, and whose am I,' *ὁ μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἐληλυθὼς . . . ὡς σκότῳ φῶς, ὡς ἀγνοίᾳ γνῶσις, ὡς νόσῳ ἴασις*. So, as Christ said, first must come the false gospel *ὑπὸ πλάνου τινος*, then, to cleanse the holy place, must the true gospel be secretly dispensed (*κρυφὰ διαπεμφθῆναι εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν ἐσομένων αἱρέσεων*). At the end of the world comes Antichrist and Christ, at whose advent all the works

of darkness shall become invisible (ἀφανῆ). The source of error in man is ignorance of this Canon of Dualism. II. 18. ἐπεὶ οὖν, ὡς ἔφην, τὸν Κανόνα τῆς Συζυγίας ἀγνοοῦσί τινες, so the character and origin of Simon Magus is not rightly known. Νῦν δὲ ἀγνοούμενος, οὐκ ὀρθῶς πιστεύεται.

In such a system, then, everything is adapted and arranged for the trial and probation of man the individual. Punishment is corrective and admonitory, and aims at the restoration of the sinner (XII. 32): it is not GOD's will that he should be unhappy, but the inevitable result of his own free choice. GOD forces none to obey and love him. All trials and diseases in life have this single object, the testing of the Saints, who give up, with prudent foresight and sincere faith in GOD's promises, the pleasures of the present world. In opposition to the enemies of Providence (that much impugned doctrine in this period; compare LACTANTIUS), it is maintained that not the smallest thing happens without GOD; and thus it must be confessed that the writer has caught hold of the main teaching of Christianity from its human side; the extension of the idea of Πρόνοια from *national* or *cosmic* to *individual* life. Much the same principle underlies this sentence (XII. 32): Δίκαιος δὲ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος ὁ τοῦ εὐλόγου ἕνεκα τῇ φύσει μαχόμενος, for merit resides not in letter of scripture or in verbal obedience, but in the innate sense of right and wrong, and the cultivation of moral spontaneity.

PART IV.

More particular account of the origin of Evil in the CLEMENTINE *HOMILIES.*

§ 1. From the standpoint of human nature, based on the value of the *personal* will and free choice, the evil in the world is capable of explanation. The *Moral* difficulties vanish, to a great extent, if we may assume a rival principle to the will of GOD, who seeks to divert us from thoughts on our true

home, Eternity, and who already anticipates our appearance in the world by his opposition to God (merely transient and fictitious though it may perhaps be). Our *moral* nature implies choice; but choice implies opposites and contraries; thus nothing, not our pain, or success, or disease or health, or poverty or riches, falls outside the counsels of God, who tries, by means of His two servants, of what temper we are. Thus, from an *ethical* point of view, we may silence our doubts; for it would be difficult to imagine a *moral* world except in this way; but the *speculative* problems as to the origin and nature of the Evil One remain unsolved. In the Homilies Books XIX and XX are given up to this discussion, which is significantly omitted in the *later* Recognitions.

There are two arguments, one with Simon in XIX, the other with the believing disciples in XX. Simon is an adversary whose main object is to perplex, and it is difficult to form an accurate idea of his doctrine. At first he wishes to shift the responsibility of evil from the Devil to his Creator. 'Who is the Evil One?' I do not know, but believe that he exists, as Christ told us: *διὸ κἀγὼ σύμφημι αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν.* 'Is he create or uncreate? (*γενητός, ἀγένητος*), for if we discover his author, we shall transfer the blame.' Not so, for perhaps God cannot prevent it, *εἰ δὲ οὐδ' αὐτὸς δυνατός, κρείττων ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἀδυνατεῖν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν εὐεργετεῖν ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὀκνῶν.* [Here Peter approaches the position of J. S. Mill.] Even if created by God, God is not blameworthy, for good men have bad sons. He is created, but does not receive his evil from God; and yet we must allow that nothing happens contrary to God's will, Who (§ 12) can be *προβολεὺς . . . τῶν τεσσάρων οὐσιῶν, θερμοῦ λέγω καὶ ψυχροῦ, ὑγροῦ τε καὶ ξηροῦ.* At first they were simple: *ὡς πρῶτα ἁπλῆ καὶ ἀμιγῆ ὄντα πρὸς οὐδέτερον ἔχειν τὴν ὄρεξιν, προβληθέντα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἔξω κραθέντα γένεσθαι ζῷον, προαίρεσιν ἔχον ὀλοθρεῦσαι κακούς* (a). Inasmuch as all these are born from God, *ὁ Πονηρὸς οὔτ' ἄλλοθέν ἐστιν, οὔτ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ . . . Θεοῦ τὴν κακίαν εἴληφε*, because these *οὐσίαι*

in themselves at first neither bad nor good, *οὐθέτεραι οὖσαι πεφυλοκρινημέναι ἐξ αὐτοῦ προβέβληνται, καὶ ἔξω αὐταῖς κραθείσαις ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ τέχνης, βουλήσει* (= *voluntario motu?*) *συμβέβηκεν ἡ πρὸς τὸν τῶν κακῶν ὄλεθρον ἐπιθυμία* (b). Here appears the inconsistency of a proposed explanation, half *physical*, half *moral*; and again, this conception of the Devil as the willing minister of GOD's righteous judgements, is quite incomplete, and takes no notice of the element of *moral* perversion, being little more than PHILO's notion of the *βασιλικὴ δύναμις*. This view is rejected by Simon: *Δυνατὸς οὖν ὑπάρχων ὁ Θεὸς κιρνᾶν τὰ στοιχεῖα, καὶ ποιεῖν κράσεις, πρὸς ἃς βούλεται γένεσθαι προαιρέσεις, διὰ τί μὴ ἐποίει ἀγαθῶν προαιρετικὴν τὴν ἑκάστου κρᾶσιν;* (a question which is always being asked in some form). Peter at last grants that this peculiar temper of the Devil arose in accordance with GOD's will: *οὕτως βουλῇ τοῦ συγκιρνάντος συμβέβηκεν ὡς ἠθέλησεν ἡ τῶν Κακῶν προαίρεσις* (c). Here is clearly an inconsistency: the Devil passes from antagonism to GOD into the position of an agent.

In § 14 Simon suggests an honest Dualism of GOD and Matter: *τί δὲ εἰ ἡ Ὕλη αὐτῷ σύγχρονος οὖσα καὶ ἰσοδύναμος ὡς ἐχθρὰ προβάλλει αὐτῷ ἡγέμονας ἐμποδίζοντας αὐτοῦ τοῖς βουλήμασι;* so again, § 17: Μήτι ἀεὶ ὢν καὶ οὕτως ἀναιρεῖται τὰ τῆς Μοναρχίας, συναρχούσης καὶ ἑτέρας τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ὕλην δυνάμεως[1]; There are two ways of regarding the material substrate, as *limiting* or *aspiring after* the good, or the intellectual world. PLUTARCH, in his 'Isis and Osiris,' adopts the former view (both are possible in Platonic thought), and is almost tempted to personify the *weakness* of the receptive element into obstinate rebellion.

This Peter denies; Matter recognizes and obeys GOD, and Jesus in the miracles shows His power over it. Simon wishes to press Peter to one of two conclusions; either we start from

[1] Dressel's translation here quite misses the point, and is ungrammatical: for use of *μητί γε* = nonne (hypothetical and suggestive), see XX. 9 (ad fin.).

GOD's omnipotence, and believe him to be the Author of Evil; or preferring to connect the Divine Nature rather with *goodness* than *power*, we suppose Matter to be almost independent of this authority. 'If GOD ensouled Matter, *ἐνεψύχωσεν αὐτὴν οὐκ αὐτὸς αἴτιός ἐστιν ὧν αὐτὴ τίκτει κακῶν;*' Peter replies with a compendium of orthodox doctrine: 'all earthly evils arise because of man's fall' (*ἕρπετα ἰόβολα, βοτανaὶ θανάσιμοι,* and Daemons); 'and if you ask why man was thus made capable of death, I respond because he is free (*αὐτεξούσιος*).'

§ 16. Nor is GOD unjust, if he makes use of the Devil's malice for his own righteous ends: *εἰ ἀποστάντα αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἄρχειν τῶν ὁμοίων κατέστησε νόμῳ, τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐπάγειν τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι κελεύσας αὐτῷ, οὐκ ἄδικός ἐστιν.* § 17. Simon, thinking more of his *opposition* to GOD than his *ministry*, asks: why *εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ κακῷ ἐσόμενον, γινόμενον αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀνεῖλε;* § 18. Simon starts a third possible theory, taking its origin from pantheism: Evil only relative: *Μήτι οὖν τῶν πρός τί ἐστιν;* depends on its *object* for its qualification: in this way all distinctions vanish; evil is not evil, nor is good, good; all is in Heraclitean flux: *ἑκάτερον γὰρ θἄτερον ἐργάζεται.* So, § 19: *Μήτι οὖν οὐκ ἔστι τῇ φύσει πονηρὸν ἢ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ νόμῳ διαφέρει καὶ ἔθει;* that is, the Source of Life, physical or mental, is indifferent; and all morality grows up by convention, and depends on institutions which are only locally valid.

In § 20 Peter introduces a new idea—Sin neither truly existent nor eternal: *οὐκ ἄρα ὑπάρχει τὸ Πονηρὸν ἀεί, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὴν ὑπάρξαι δύναται.*

The rest of this book XIX is occupied with Simon's gnostic attacks on the evils, cruelty, inequality of this world; and shows clearly how entirely the early heresies depended upon this widespread Discontent, whether it were *practical* or *speculative* Peter replies: 'Much physical evil in the world arises from our carelessness, from neglect of the rules of health or the fitting periods of generation. And besides, pains here

are to correct sin, and to lead away from ignorance: if you are good, you will not suffer: δὸς τὸν μὴ ἁμαρτάνοντα καὶ λαβὲ τὸν μὴ πάσχοντα. This is very inconsistent; here pain, instead of being a *probation*, is a *retribution*. But the position of the former books is that pain in this life is the inseparable lot of those who choose eternal happiness. 'As to the terrible injustice and inequality of life, it is necessary for the perfection of saints; some by suffering, others by seizing an occasion of charity, are made pious (εὐσεβεῖς ἀποτελεσθῆναι).' Simon departs, after an angry reply and an indignant and somewhat modern protest, that in this theory the poor are a mere instrument for the perfection of the wealthy.

In the next book Peter undertakes privately to explain the truth τῆς περὶ τοῦ Πονηροῦ ἁρμονίας. The Devil is the duly appointed king of the present world, ὃς καὶ ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ πονηρῶν χαίρειν ἐκράθη (d). Now this feeling, though in itself not commendable, is used by God, who cannot punish sinners directly: καὶ ὡς ἰδίᾳ χαριζόμενος ἐπιθυμίᾳ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ βούλησιν ἐκτελεῖ. Christ on the other hand is *created* (δημιουργηθείς) to rejoice in authority over the good, and saves them to eternal life, ἑαυτῷ χαριζόμενος τὴν ὑπὲρ τούτων εἰς Θεὸν ἀναφέρει χάριν. Both please themselves, but in doing so serve God; and both are ministers and agents of God's good pleasure: οἱ δύο ἡγέμονες οὗτοι ταχεῖαι χεῖρες εἰσὶ Θεοῦ προλαμβάνειν ἐπιθυμοῦσαι καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ θέλημα ἐπιτελεῖν· even now desirous of anticipating the *pains* of the wicked, the *delights* of the just. It is God who really acts throughout; He kills and makes alive: ἀποκτείνει μὲν διὰ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς . . . διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ κακώσει τῶν ἀσεβῶν χαίρειν κραθέντος Πονηροῦ. σώζει δὲ καὶ εὐεργετεῖ διὰ τῆς δεξιᾶς . . . διὰ τοῦ ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ δικαίων χαίρειν δημιουργηθέντος Ἀγαθοῦ.

XX. 3. Εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι τὰς οὐσίας ἔχοντες οὐκ ἔξωθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστιν ἑτέρα τις ἀρχή . . . οὐ μὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ζῷα προεβλήθησαν· ὁμόδοξοι γὰρ αὐτῷ ἦσαν . . . οὔτε συμβεβήκασιν αὐτομάτως, παρὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ βουλὴν γεγόνοτες, ἐπεὶ τὸ τῆς δυνάμεως

αὐτοῦ μέγιστον ἀνῄρητο ἄν, . . . ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μὲν προβέβληται τὰ πρώτιστα στοιχεῖα τέσσαρα (warm, cold, wet, dry, *or* fire, air, water, earth). Whence GOD is the Father of all existence (*ὅθεν δὴ καὶ Πατὴρ τυγχάνει πάσης οὐσίας,—οὔσης γνώμης τῆς κατὰ τὴν κρᾶσιν* (His plan as to the mixture of elements taking effect?) The materials or elements of creation then come from GOD himself by *projection*: His design as to their commingling and permeation then takes effect. Yet out of this purely *physical* conception arises, by a sudden turn, the idea of *moral* difference: *ἔξω γὰρ κραθεῖσιν αὐτοῖς ὡς τέκνον ἡ Προαίρεσις ἐγεννήθη.* And so the Devil is really only a *minister* of GOD, and is blameless: *ὁ οὖν Πονηρὸς πρὸς τῷ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος κόσμου τέλει ὑπουργήσας ἀμέμπτως τῷ Θεῷ (ἅτε δὴ οὐ μιᾶς οὐσίας ὢν τῆς πρὸς κακίαν μόνης), μετασυγκριθεὶς ἀγαθὸς γένεσθαι δύναται. οὐδὲ γὰρ νῦν κακόν τι ποιεῖ, καίτοι Κακὸς ὤν, νομίμως κακουχεῖν εἰληφὼς τὴν ἐξουσίαν.* This universalist and Origenian doctrine on the return of Satan to his allegiance, seems to depend upon a dim adumbration of modern science: thought is molecular displacement, and character depends upon a particular arrangement of atoms. And it is quite obvious that this writer who insists most strongly on *human* freedom and responsibility, shrinks from attributing the same liberty to the Evil angels, i. e. is reduced to a *physical* instead of an *ethical* explanation.)

XX. 5. Sophonias states an article of his belief which strikes at the entire Gnostic doctrine of Emanation and successive Deterioration: *τὸ μὲν γεννῆσαι (Θεὸν) δίδωμι, τὸ δὲ ἀνόμοιον αὐτῷ γεννῆσαι οὐκ ἀποδίδωμι.* Peter becomes pensive at this (*ἐπὶ συννοίας γενόμενος*), and repents of having begun this inextricable discussion, and sets forth a vague theory of GOD's power to 'change' things, even Himself.

Ὁ μὲν προβάλλων καὶ εἰς ἑτέραν οὐσίαν τραπέντα πάλιν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν τρέπειν δύναται, ὁ δὲ προβληθεὶς τῆς ἐξ ἐκείνου τροπῆς . . . τέκνον ὑπάρχων, ἄνευ τοῦ προβάλλοντος βουλῆς ἄλλο τι γενέσθαι οὐ δύναται, εἰ μὴ ἐκεῖνος θέλει. Thus the Devil *is exactly what*

God wishes him to be, and cannot overpower the law of his own nature and conformation. XX. 8. Michaiah asks if the Good spirit γεγένηται like the Evil? If so, they seem to be brothers. Peter replies: *οὐχ ὁμοίως γεγόνασιν . . . τοῦ Πονηροῦ ἡ τετραγένης τοῦ σώματος οὐσία πεφυλοκρινημένη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ προεβλήθη, ἔξω δὲ αὐτῆς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ προβάλλοντος βουλὴν ἐκράθη πρὸς τὴν κρᾶσιν ἡ κακοῖς χαίρουσα προαίρεσις* (e). (It appears then that God is the author of so-called Evil, by deliberate creation or projection of elements so mingled, that a certain ἕξις necessarily came upon them, and will continue until the component parts are redistributed.) But this hypothesis is not readily accepted: *διὰ τί δὲ ἔξω ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κραθείσης οὐσίας ἡ συμβεβηκυῖα κακοῖς χαίρουσα προαίρεσις ἐπεγίνετο* (f); For as to the 'Evil' Will (whatever the exact sense of 'Evil'):

> *οὔτε ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται,*
> *οὔτε ὑφ' ἑτέρου τινος,*
> *οὔτε ὑφ' αὐτοῦ προβέβληται,*
> *οὔτε αὐτομάτως προελήλυθεν,*
> *οὔτε ἀεὶ ἦν (ὡς ἡ πρὸ τῆς συγκράσεως οὐσία),*

ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ βούλησιν ἔξω τῇ κράσει συμβέβηκεν. Ὁ δὲ Ἀγαθὸς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ καλλίστης τροπῆς γεννηθεὶς καὶ οὐκ ἔξω κράσει συμβεβηκὼς τῷ ὄντι Υἱός ἐστιν. It cannot be denied that we have here the worst features of the Necessitarian and Impersonal view of God, which lies at the root of Gnosticisms. In this difficulty the writer flies to a refuge which he had once abandoned with contempt—the letter of Scripture: *ἐπεὶ ταῦτα ἄγραφα τυγχάνει καὶ στοχασμοῖς πεπιστωμένα, μὴ πάντως ἡμῖν οὕτως ἔχειν βεβαιούσθω* (compare Origen, who imposes a similar condition on his speculation in his 'Principia'; and it may here be remarked that the Doctrine of Reserve, so generally supposed to be the edifice of aristocratic pride and intellectualism, may with equal likelihood be founded on humility: the *ἀπορρήτων εὕρεσις* is not *certain* and there-

fore cannot be communicated to all men as authoritative Dogma).

But a still more complete exculpation of the Devil awaits us; in XX. 9, Lazarus now boldly puts a question, which has been on our tongues for some time past: Πῶς δυνατὸν εὔλογον εἶναι τὸν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ δικαίου καταστάντα Πονηρὸν ὥστε ἀσεβησάντων εἶναι τιμωρόν, τοῦτον αὐτὸν ὕστερον μετὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγγέλων σὺν τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ κατώτερον πέμπεσθαι; there remains, then, to sever the notion of pain from the Devil's sojourn in Hell; for the Devil is an Angel who *fears* God, *performs* His will, and *punishes* His traitors. Peter: Κἀγὼ ὁμολογῶ ὅτι ὁ Πονηρὸς πονηρὸν οὐδὲν ποιεῖ, καθὸ τὸν δοθέντα αὐτῷ νόμον ἐκτελεῖ. Καίτοι προαίρεσιν ἔχων κακὴν ὅμως φόβῳ τῷ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν οὐδὲν ἀδίκως πράσσει (notice that προαίρεσις has now lost its true *personal* and *ethical* significance, and is confused with the necessary result of a certain mixture of elements). Διαβάλλων δὲ διδασκάλους ἀληθείας εἰς ἐνέδραν τῶν ἀκριτῶν καὶ διάβολος ὁ αὐτὸς ὀνομάζεται.—To this conclusion there is but one corollary, a modified belief in 'happiness in Hell.' Ὁ Πονηρὸς σκότῳ χαίρειν κατὰ τὴν κρᾶσιν γεγονώς, μετὰ τῶν ὁμοδούλων ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ταρτάρου σκότος κατελθὼν ἥδεται· φιλὸν γὰρ πυρὶ τὸ σκότος. Whereas men's souls, φωτὸς καθαροῦ σταγόνες οὖσαι, are punished in such environment. Thus it is clear that man's spiritual nature differs from the devil's, and in reality only the former is free, the latter being *physically* so compounded that his character is foredetermined and is not the result of free-will. If he were not thus sent into darkness, τότε οὐ δύναται ἡ κακοῖς αὐτοῦ χαίρουσα κρᾶσις μετασυγκριθῆναι εἰς ἀγαθοῦ προαίρεσιν (?) (f). (This sentence is very ambiguous, but seems to imply a future change in his temper when his work of *thwarting*, *chastising*, *deceiving*, in accordance with God's will shall be over.) Καὶ οὕτως ἀγαθὸς (? ἀγαθοῖς) συνεῖναι κριθήσεται ταύτῃ μᾶλλον, ὅτι κακοῖς χαίρουσαν λελογχὼς κρᾶσιν (g), αἰτίᾳ τοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν φόβου οὐδὲν παρὰ τὸ δοκοῦν τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμῳ διεπράξατο. May not, he asks, the

story of the change of Aaron's rod into a snake and back again into a rod be a foreshadowing in mystic language of the Devil's altered character? (*τὴν τοῦ Πονηροῦ ὕστερον γενησομένην τῆς τροπῆς μετασύγκρασιν.*)

PART V.

THE RECOGNITIONS.

In this somewhat more orthodox recension, we have the same doctrine of the two kingdoms, to be chosen by the free-will of each.

Duo regna constituit Deus et principes emisit: unum saeculare et praesenti voluptatis praemio coronatum; alterum, fide prehensum sed aeternam mercedem pollicens. Hic boni male habentur; et pessimus quisque insultat melioribus:—ita dubitari non potest, reservari utrumque in meritorum suorum compensationem. This is the *moral* distinction of the two realms of time and eternity; (so I. 24 *Duo regna posuit praesentis dico temporis et futuri*): but we have besides the *physical* distinction: I. 27 *Ita totius Mundi machinam, cum una domus esset, in duas dividit regiones. Divisionis autem haec fuit causa, ut superna regio angelis habitaculum, inferior vero praeberet hominibus:—et sic cuncta praeparata sunt ut hominibus qui habitarent in ea, essent facultas his omnibus pro arbitrio uti, ... sive ad bona velint, sive ad mala.*—III. 52 *Potestatem dedit unicuique arbitrii sui, ut hoc esse possit quod vult, et rursum* praevidens *quia ista potestas arbitrii alios quidem faceret eligere bona, alios vero mala, et per hoc in duos ordines necessario propagandum esset hominum genus,—unicuique ordini concessit et locum et regem, quem vellet eligere; bonus enim rex bonis gaudet, et malignus malis.*—IV. 19 *Est ergo in potestate uniuscuiusque* (*quia liberi arbitrii factus est homo*), *utrum nobis* (Apostles) *velit audire ad vitam, an daemonibus ad interitum.*—IV. 25. God foresees perversion of His good

gift, and arranges accordingly; but this foresight in no way interferes with free choice:—*Praevidit diversos ordines atque officia differentia, ut esset diversitas in ordinibus et officiis, secundum proprios animorum motus, ex arbitrii libertate proferendos.* He thus foresees sin, but does not force thereto: and He prepares a system of corrective punishment for our good:—*Oportuit ergo esse et poenarum ministros, quos tamen arbitrii libertas in hunc ordinem traheret*: besides *debuerunt habere quos vincerent hi qui agones susceperant caelestium praemiorum.*

V. 9 *Qui permanet in malo et servus est Mali, non potest effici portio Boni; quia ab initio, ut ante diximus, duo regna statuit Deus, et potestatem dedit unicuique hominum, ut illius regni fiat portio, cui se ad obedientiam ipse subiecerit.* God has clearly defined this: *non posse unum hominem utriusque regni esse servum.*

VIII. 52. How justly God succours the corrupt state of the world! *ut quoniam bonis Dei mala (quae ex peccato originem sumpserant) sociata sunt, duabus his partibus duos principes poneret, et ei qui bonis gaudet bonorum ordinem . . . . statuit, ei vero qui malis gaudet, ea quae contra ordinem et inutiliter geruntur (ex quibus sine dubio etiam Providentiae fides in dubium veniat); et habita est per hoc a iusto Deo iusta divisio.*—II. 18. The origin and wiles of the Devil (about which subject the Recognitions observe a certain reticence) are made to depend on Man's need of probation:—*ut ergo infideles a fidelibus, pii discernantur ab impiis, permissum est Maligno uti his artibus, quibus singulorum erga verum parentem probentur affectus.* So § 17 *Studet Inimicus . . . . inimicos eos efficere conditori suo.* III. 55 *Propter hos ergo qui salutis suae neglectu placent Malo, et eos qui studio utilitatis suae placere cupiunt Bono,—paria quaedam ad temptationem praesenti huic saeculo statuta sunt.* § 59 *Paria quaedam huic mundo destinasse Deum; ille qui primus ex paribus venit, a Malo est, qui secundus a Bono*; and every one has a chance of making up his mind (*occasio iudicii*), whether he is foolish

and believes the first who comes, or whether, being wise, he is able to discern the Spirits.—§ 61 *Paria . . . . huic mundo destinata sunt ab initio saeculi* :—

Cain.	Abel.
The Giants.	Noah.
Pharaoh.	Abraham.
The Philistines.	Isaac.
Esau.	Jacob.
The Magicians.	Moses.
The Tempter.	The Son of Man.
Simon Magus.	Peter.
(All nations.)	Verbi Seminator (?).
Anti-Christ.	Christ.

There is no intelligible account given of the Fall of Man; *mundani spiritus* are casually mentioned. I. 42. Daemons clearly exercise a kind of divine commission to try nations and individuals. IV. 33. We overcome them not by our own strength; *sed propter Dei, qui eos subiecit, potestatem.* —VIII. 50 (*Deus*) *magis indulsit per singulas gentes angelos quosdam agere principatum, qui malis gaudent.*—We cannot throw the responsibility of our faults on the Devils: II. 18 *Quomodo ergo dicemus Malignum esse causam peccati nostri, quum hoc permissu Dei fiat, ut per ipsum probentur?* and IX. 16, Clement's father sums up the 'sermon' of his son rightly: *cum eo quod inest libertas arbitrii, est extrinsecus et aliqua Causa mali, ex qua per diversas concupiscentias* incitantur *quidem homines, non tamen* coguntur *ad peccatum.*

We may ask then, what is Sin? VIII. 51 *Ex arbitrii libertate unusquisque hominum, dum incredulus est de futuris* (that is, about the righteous personality and Providence of God, about the purposeful origin and final justice of the world), *per malos actus incurrit in mala*; and into a superficial, suspicious, and short-sighted philosophy of present enjoyment.—Belief in the Christian message, i.e. in future

judgement and eternal life, cannot come by intellectual process: it is rather an irresistible corollary (compare FICHTE's *Vocation of Man*, Book III). V. 35 *Non aliter scire poteritis* (the truth of our preaching), *nisi ut obedientes his quae mandantur ipso rerum exitu et beatitudinis certissimo fine doceamini*[1]. —The Christian is therefore contrasted with the children of this world: VI. 13 *Debemus praecellere eos, qui praesens tantum saeculum nôrunt:* V. 5 *Pergentibus ad civitatem salutis.* What is meritorious is a belief that the Creator will at last restore the balance of justice: VII. 33 *immortalis et beata vita credentibus danda promittitur*: VIII. 48 *Divina Providentia iudicium erga omnes statuit, quia praesens saeculum non erat tale, in quo unusquisque possit pro meritis dispensari.*

The first impulse of the individual (CLEMENT'S ἡ πρώτη νεῦσις πρὸς σωτηρίαν) is curiously defined: III. 53 *Malus . . . . apud Deum qui requirere non vult quod sibi expedit* (probably ὅστις οὐ βούλεται ζητῆσαι τὸ ἑαυτῷ συμφέρον). So VIII. 59 *qui desiderium gerunt cognoscendi quod sibi expedit.* The writer here insists on the primary motive of self-interest; and this is true in a great majority of cases, if we consult history and experience. 'What shall we do to be saved?' It rises from a sense of personal unease and alienation, not, in the first instance, from a vague altruistic sentiment. The soul is for the time alone with GOD, and forgets all else in this solitude. The first gaze of the awakening spirit, now fully self-conscious, is turned within, not without. 'Is thy heart right with My heart?' is the question GOD puts to it. It inquires of itself: 'Do I realize my own dignity and worth in the eyes of GOD?' GOD distinguishes those who seek their own good and their own hurt: *Deus quod utile est* (III. 53) *occultavit hominibus* (i.e. the possession of the kingdom of heaven, or immortal life, which is the only good).

The bad, then, are the lazy; *qui neglexissent quod sibi utile et salutare esset inquirere, tamquam seipsos odio habentes.*

[1] Compare also RECOGN. II. 22: III. 37, 41, 59.

Those who recognize what is best for them extinguish the flames of the old carnal birth at the font, the second birth by water: IX. 7 *Prima enim nostra nativitas, per* ignem *concupiscentiae descendit, et ideo dispensatione divina, secunda haec per* aquam *introducitur, quae restinguat* ignis *naturam* . . . . (the soul must so live) *ut nullas omnino Mundi huius voluptates requirat, sed sit tamquam peregrinus et advena, atque alterius civitatis civis.*

Nothing can be clearer than this speculative doctrine of man's origin, duty, and destiny. The problem of the author of evil recedes into the background. The 'malign one' and his angels are indeed mentioned as they might be in orthodox Christian writings, but we miss the detailed *metaphysical* inquiry, degenerating into a mere *physical* hypothesis, which occupies the later books of the Homilies. The centre of the system in the 'Recognitions' is the free-will of man the individual, and his instinct of self-preservation, which, by means of corrective discipline (IV. 11, 23) and the probation of daemonic wiles, is educated and developed into a sincere desire for immortal life, an ascetic repudiation of all fictitious worldly delights in this, a determination to regard suffering as chastisement coming from a Father's hand, and a firm trust in God's justice and mercy (which does not wait for proof) that all present wrongs will be righted at the Judgement Day.

PART VI.

THE WRITINGS OF FIRMIANUS LACTANTIUS.

This last of the Latin writers of the Ante-Nicene Church recalls the author of the *Clementines* in two points; the formal doctrine of the origin and use of evil, and the presence of interpolations which it is difficult to separate from the text. His conception of the world-process may be gathered from

the following axioms, which resume the leading features of his doctrine :—

(*a*) He writes to effect a new alliance between *Religio* and *Sapientia*, so long divorced; the one superstitious, the other merely negative and destructive.

(*b*) He is intensely indignant against the Epicureans especially, who deny design; with these pretended philosophers the Christian has nothing in common. All others agree in believing that conscious reason rules the world with deliberate design.

(*c*) There is for the believer a moral and personal Creator; and the purpose of God in building the world for us was to put before rational beings the high prize of immortality, to be won at the price of hard toil and frequent probation.

(*d*) To this end He establishes us with free-will in a world of contraries; in the centre between bad and good, higher and lower; creating (?) a leader of the right and a leader of the left, like a constitutional monarch who establishes the useful interaction of rival parties. This God does with full fore-knowledge of the corruption and degradation of men.

(*e*) Both come from Him, Who is Almighty, yet chooses to create something that seemingly thwarts His designs. Evil He does not create, so much as '*set before*' man's eyes (*proposuit*). Evil does not then become ethical (that is, really evil) until man chooses; and this word (*proposuit*) reminds one of the continual reference to man's probation: evil in its nature is probably only in *relation* to us. All things are in pairs; a Pythagorean συστοιχία; right and left; heaven and earth; light and darkness; soul and body; and this latter is *bad* in its nature and a hindrance to our better aspirations. Apart from Evil, Good is absolutely inconceivable.

(*f*) The Final Good is clearly Immortal Life, and virtue (conceived of as an objective law) is only the means appointed by God whereby we attain to it. Virtue is pure impassibility, the absolute surrender and refusal of all the tempting allure-

ments of this life; success and happiness here is entirely incompatible with future bliss.

This *arcanum* or *sacramentum mundi* is clearly and concisely stated in Epit. 69 *Factus a Deo Mundus, ut homines nascerentur; nascuntur autem homines, ut Deum patrem agnoscant (in quo est Sapientia); agnoscunt ut colant (in quo est Iustitia); colunt ut mercedem Immortalitatis accipiant; accipiunt Immortalitatem ut in aeternum Deo serviant.* Everything is thus referred to the *moral* conception of man, and his perfecting through trial for a future inheritance.

Present interest will centre round (*d*) and (*e*), and the Lactantian idea of duality in this world, which forms the centre of his system (Opif. 10: The nose God made *ipsa duplicitate pulcerrimum. Ex quo intelligimus, quantum dualis numerus una et simplici compage solidatus ad veram valeat perfectionem*) . . . . To him *physical* motion and *moral* free-will were alike impossible, unless there existed two extremes, opposite yet in a sense united, each entailing the other, between which a path might be traversed in either direction. And so there is absolute need of antithesis: III. 29 *Ex quo fit, ut virtus nulla sit, nisi adversarius sit.* V. 7 *Virtutem aut cerni non posse, nisi habeat vitia contraria; aut non esse perfectam, nisi exerceatur adversis. Hanc enim Deus bonorum et malorum* voluit *esse distantiam, ut qualitatem boni ex malo sciamus, &c. . . . . nec alterius ratio intelligi sublato altero potest. Deus ergo non exclusit malum, ut ratio virtutis constare posset.* VI. 22 *At enim saepe dictum est, virtutem nullam futuram fuisse, nisi haberet quae opprimeret.* VII. 4 *Ipsa ratio ac necessitas exigebat et bona homini proponi, et mala; bona quibus utatur, mala quae vitet et caveat.* II. 8 (the interpolator, a somewhat bolder exponent of this theory of Subordinate Dualism): 'Bonum et malum fecit, ut posset esse Virtus, quae nisi malis agitetur, aut vim suam perdet, aut omnino non erit.' (Contrast alone brings our value of goodness and health.) Ita bonum sine malo in hac vita esse non potest. Utrumque,

licet contrarium sit, tamen ita cohaeret, ut alterum si tollas, utrumque sustuleris; nam neque bonum comprehendi et percipi potest sine declinatione et fuga mali, nec malum caveri ac vinci sine auxilio comprehensi ac percepti mali. Necesse igitur fuerat, et malum fieri, ut bonum fieret.' VII. 5 (the same later hand), some one asks, 'Cur non bonum tantum fecit, ut nemo peccaret, nemo faceret malum? Nulla . . . . virtus esse poterat, nisi diversa fecisset, nec omnino apparere vis boni potest, nisi ex mali comparatione.' Evil is nothing but 'boni interpretatio' . . . . he who instituted the circus-games 'amator unius coloris fuit, sed alterum ei et quasi aemulum posuit, ut posset esse certamen et aliqua in spectaculo gratia. Sic Deus, &c. . . . . Si desit hostis et pugna, nulla victoria est. . . . .' Virtue is made perfect 'de malorum conflictatione . . . . Ergo diversitas est, cui omnis ratio veritatis innititur . . . .' The fall of man is in reality an ascent: knowledge of good, as well as of evil, was given simultaneously: 'Qua percepta, statim de loco sancto pulsus est, in quo malum non est . . . . relegatus in hunc communem orbem ut ea utraque simul experiretur. Quamdiu in solo Bono fuit, vixit ille princeps generis humani velut infans boni et mali nescius.' (See SCHELLING's *De Origine Mali.*) On this mediety of man depends both *intellectual* and *moral* worth, his peculiar dignity 'ut ratio virtutis sapientiaeque constaret, ... inter utrumque medium, ut haberet licentiam vel mali vel boni sequendi.' —Epit. 29 *Fit ut bonum sine malo esse non possit.*—De Ira 13 *Deus proposuit ei et bona et mala, quia sapientiam dedit, cuius omnis ratio in discernendis malis et bonis sita est. . . . . Invicem sibi alterutra connexa sunt, ut sublato alterutro utrumque sit tolli necesse . . . . positis tantummodo in conspectu bonis, quid opus est cogitatione, intellectu, scientia, ratione?* § 15 *Jam superius explanavi simul Deum proposuisse bonum et malum (et bonum quidem diligere, malum autem . . . . odisse); sed ideo malum premisisse, ut et bonum emicaret: quod alterum sine altero (sicut saepe docui) intelligimus constare non posse.*

The difficulties and inconsistencies which arise afterwards in this dogma have their origin in the fluctuation between the *physical* and *moral*, the *impersonal* and *personal* conceptions. And it may here be remarked that the old feud of religion and philosophy (*Religio: Sapientia*) among the ancient Greeks may be traced to the same ambiguity. The extreme emphasis on capricious *personality* in popular superstition leads in reaction to the complete elimination of will and purpose from the theology of reflecting men, and the search for a *metaphysical* unity takes the place of an inquiry into *moral* motives and sacrifices of propitiation. Excessive anthropomorphism of mythology is followed by Ionic hylozoism, and later by the postulate of τὸ θεῖον or νόησις νοήσεως, which has no human affinities. LACTANTIUS alternates between a *physical* theory of God's development by contraries, in which there is always a systoechy of higher and lower in nature (whence comes our virtue and vice, as we choose one or the other), and a purely *moral* notion of evil: IV. 25 (sin is not) *necessitatis* (=physical and inevitable), *sed propositi ac voluntatis.* VI. 23 *Mens est enim profecto quae peccat.* Similarly, the leaders of this great struggle sometimes retire into the background, leaving only antithetic forces of nature, or come into prominence as independent *moral* wills, as persons fighting for the possession of man. I shall first cite those passages in which the *physical* polarity of the universe is traced to natural and inevitable causes; and next, and in conclusion, those in which the Evil Spirit is described as *personal.* In the first it is clear that the responsibility is thrown back upon the Creator, Who thus perhaps ceases to be a *moral* governor, and becomes rather a delighted spectator of mimic warfare. In the second series the emphasis is laid on the *personality* of Satan; but it is impossible to acquit LACTANTIUS of the charge of colouring this with *physical* notions. The first set of quotations tends to make it doubtful if the Body is not the sole cause of sin; the second reminds us that the Spirit is free. But it may be

plausibly urged that it is the diverse character of the Good and the Bad Spirit that entails this system of confronting opposites in creation. Even in the former group frequent traces of this view may be found.

II. 9. Above God placed *lucem perennem et superos et vitam perpetuam, et contra in terra, tenebras et inferos et mortem.* So East and West, or the gates and grave of light. Day is of God, as are *omnia quaecumque meliora sunt; nox autem quam occidens extremus induxit, eius scilicet quem Dei esse aemulum diximus.* Again: *Nox, quam pravo illi antitheo dicimus attributam.* Elements are diverse: *Duo igitur illa principalia inveniuntur, quo diversam et contrariam sibi habent potestatem; calor et humor.*

II. 12. *In ipsius autem hominis fictione illarum duarum materiarum, quas inter se diximus esse contrarias, ignis et aquae conclusit perfecitque rationem . . . . Ex rebus igitur diversis ac repugnantibus homo factus est, sicut ipse Mundus ex luce et tenebris, ex vita et morte; quae duo inter se pugnare in homine praecepit. Utriusque officia sunt, ut hoc quod est ex caelo et Deo, imperet; illud vero quod ex terra est et Diabolo, serviat.*—III. 6 *Ita quoniam ex his duobus constamus elementis, quorum alterum luce praeditum est, alterum tenebris* (part is given to knowledge, part to ignorance).—IV. 25 *Etenim cum constet homo ex carne et spiritu . . . . caro quoniam terrena est . . . . copulatum sibi spiritum trahit secum* (but he is careful in this passage, as noted above, to guard himself from a mere superficial, necessitarian view of evil, as in the Manichean system; sin is a matter of the will (*propositi ac voluntatis*).—VI. 22 *Itaque fecit omnia Deus ad instruendum certamen duarum rerum.*—VII. 4 *Quoniam homo ex rebus diversis ac repugnantibus configuratus est, anima et corpore, id est, caelo atque terra, tenui et comprehensibili, aeterno ac temporali, sensibili atque bruto, luce praedito atque tenebroso; ipsa ratio ac necessitas exigebat et bona homini proponi et mala.*—VII. 5. For at the creation of man God *spiritum suum terreno corpore induit et involvit, ut compactus ex rebus diversis ac repugnantibus bonum ac malum*

caperet. . . . . Ergo quia virtutem proposuit homini Deus, licet anima et corpus consociata sunt; tamen contraria sunt, et impugnant invicem.—VII. 9 *Rerum Natura his duobus elementis, quae repugnantia sibi et inimica sunt, constat, igne et aqua* (one ascribed to heaven and the other to earth).—De Ira, 15 *Denique ipsum mundum ex duobus elementis repugnantibus et invicem copulatis esse concretum, igneo et humido . . . . Sic et nos ex duobus aeque repugnantibus compacti sumus, animo et corpore, quorum alterum caelo ascribitur, quia tenue est et intractabile, alterum terrae, quia comprehensibile est; alterum solidum et aeternum est, alterum fragile atque mortale. Hinc existit in hominibus naturae suae depravatio.*—§ 19 *Sed quoniam compactus est, ut diximus e duobus, animo et corpore, in altero virtutes, in altero vitia continentur, et impugnant invicem.*

It appears then as if it were matter that was evil: we have besides certain inconsistent passages like the following:—II. 11 *Illius est totum (= Dei) quicquid sumus.* Yet the Supreme Good concerns the soul alone: III. 9 *(Summum Bonum) ut solius animi sit, nec communicari possit cum corpore.*—V. 21 *Non perspiciunt altius vim rationemque hominis, quae tota non in corpore sed in mente est.*—VI. 17 *Nos autem Summum Bonum non referimus ad corpus, sed omne officium solius animae conservatione metimur.*—But again we have IV. 24 (reminding us of Theophylact's ὅτι οὐ φύσει ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ σάρξ), Christ came in the flesh, *ut ostendat etiam carnem posse capere virtutem.* Yet their good is mutually exclusive: *Animi bona mala sunt corporis, id est, opum fuga, voluptatum interdictio, doloris mortisque contemptus. Ita corporis bona mala sunt animi. . . . . Qui mavult bene vivere in aeternum, male vivit ad tempus et afficitur omnibus molestiis et laboribus.*—VII. 10 *Sicut duae vitae propositae sunt homini, quarum altera est animae, altera corporis; ita et mortes duae.*—VII. 12 (Platonic theory of the fall of the Soul) *Quia tenebroso domicilio terrenae carnis inclusa est* (so also De Ira, 1).—De Ira, 10 *Cui particulam de Sua sapientia dedit, et instruxit eum ratione, quantum fragilitas terrena capiebat.*

§ 19. The soul's goods, which consist *in continendis libidinibus contraria sunt corpori; et corporis bona, quae sunt in omni genere voluptatum, inimica sunt animo.* § 20 *Adeo subiecta est peccato fragilitas carnis, qua induti sumus.*

There are here confused traces of three different versions of the origin of Evil: (1) The 'Platonic' (as it is called), which is clearly restated by PLUTARCH (*de Is. et Osir.*) that matter coexists with God, and can be only imperfectly brought under discipline by His persuasion; (2) that evil (or the possibility of it) is necessary from the configuration of the universe and Man, the microcosm, by an Almighty power, Who expresses Himself by opposites (*physical*); (3) that the world indeed is created entirely good (or, perhaps more accurately, indifferent), but the Evil Spirit and Man's Free-will find means of perverting its use to their own hurt.

We must now review those passages, which refer to the creation of Free Spirits (noting whether here, too, the complete independence of the *personal* is really preserved, and whether the character of the bad, as well as of the good, spirit is not a direct creation of God). As to the real hostility of this evil power to God, there is no doubt, whatever its cause. II. 1. The ingratitude of men, whence can it come, unless there be *aliquam perversam potestatem, quae veritatis semper sit inimica, quae humanis erroribus gaudeat, cui unum ac perpetuum sit opus, offundere tenebras et hominum caecare mentes, ne lucem videant, ne denique in caelum aspiciant.*—III. 29. As we Christians know that Fortune is nothing at all, *ita scimus esse pravum et subdolum spiritum, qui sit inimicus bonis . . . . qui contraria facit quam Deus.*—And thus a wilful rebel will be eternally punished: VII. 26 *perpetuo igni cremabitur in aeternum.* II. 17. He who yields to his evil advice *in illa decidet, quae in distributione rerum attributa esse ipsi malorum principi disputavimus, in tenebras scilicet et inferos et supplicium sempiternum.*

But in the following passages the *responsibility* of the Devil

is by no means clear, and a certain physical necessity seems to overpower the unbiassed free-will: (but if Satan be a mere agent of the divine will, the question put in Hom. XX will press upon us for solution.) II. 8. Before God began the creation of the world, *produxit similem sui spiritum, qui esset virtutibus Dei patris praeditus . . . . Deinde fecit alterum in quo indoles divinae stirpis non permansit.* Tainted with the poison of his own envy, *suo arbitrio (quod illi a Deo liberum datum fuerat) contrarium sibi nomen ascivit . . . . Invidit enim illi antecessori suo, qui Deo patri perseverando . . . . carus est. Hunc ergo* ex bono per se *malum effectum Graeci* διάβολον *appellant, nos criminatorem vocamus, quod crimina in quae ipse illicit, ad Deum deferat.* But the interpolator is bolder: he begins the discussion by the statement: 'Fecit in principio bonum et malum'; and attempts to explain Satan's fall: 'Cur autem iustus Deus talem *voluerit* esse (explicabo). Fabricaturus Deus hunc Mundum, qui constaret ex rebus inter se contrariis atque discordibus, constituit ante diversa, fecitque ante omnia duos fontes rerum sibi adversantium, inter seque pugnantium; illos videlicet duos spiritus, rectum atque pravum, quorum alter est Deo tanquam dextra, alter tanquam sinistra, ut in eorum essent potestate contraria illa, quorum mixtura et temperatione Mundus . . . . constaret.' It will be seen that the interpolator, in the interests of the doctrine of omnipotence, leans to an entirely physical interpretation of evil.

'Quoniam fas non erat, ut a Deo proficisceretur malum (neque enim contra se ipse faciet); illum constituit malorum inventorem, quem cum faceret, dedit illi ad mala excogitanda ingenium et astutiam, ut in eo esset et voluntas prava, et perfecta nequitia; et ab eo contraria virtutibus suis voluit oriri, eumque secum contendere, utrumne ipse plus bonorum daret, an ille plus malorum. Sed rursus, quoniam Deo summo repugnari non potest, bonorum suorum potestatem illi ultori (*or* alteri) assignavit, quem supra bonum et perfectum esse diximus. Ita duos ad certamen composuit et instruxit, sed eorum

alterum dilexit, ut bonum filium, alterum abdicavit, ut malum. (The angels too are formed to be his ministers 'unius sed repugnantis naturae; cf. *De Ira*, 15. Some remained good, others fell, but in the beginning all were 'pares aequa conditione apud Deum,' which is inconsistent with the description of the Devil just given.) 'Cum autem Deus ex his duobus alterum bono praeposuisset, alterum malo, exorsus est fabricam Mundi, omnibus his quos creavit ministrantibus et per certa officia dispositis.' (When therefore we read 'pars . . . . perversa voluntate descivit,' we feel there is an intrusion of an alien idea. 'Who doth resist His will?')—In LACTANTIUS himself, II. 9, the night is given to the *pravus Antitheus*; and II. 14, we have *cui ab initio dederat terrae potestatem.*—V. 22 *Deo quia repugnari non potest, ipse adversarios nomini suo* excitat, *non qui contra ipsum demum pugnent, sed contra milites eius.*—VI. 6 *Fons autem bonorum Deus est, malorum vero ille scilicet Divini nominis semper inimicus.* Opif. 19; (The interpolator explains the Devil's origin from the *moral* nature of man: 'Dedit ei et constituit adversarium nequissimum et fallacissimum spiritum, cum quo in hac terrestri vita sine ulla securitatis requie dimicaret. Cur autem Deus hunc vexatorem generis humani constituerit, breviter exponam. Ante omnia diversitatem voluit esse (ideoque vulgo non aperuit veritatem, sed eam paucissimis revelavit); quae diversitas omne arcanum Mundi continet . . . . Noluit enim Deus hominem ad illam immortalem beatitudinem delicato itinere pervenire. Daturus ergo virtutem, dedit hostem prius, qui animis hominum cupiditates et vitia immitteret; qui esset auctor errorum malorumque omnium machinator, ut quoniam Deus hominem ad vitam vocat, ille contra . . . . traducat ad mortem.'

Virtue is conceived of as mere impassible refusal to yield to the pains or pleasures of life, which be it noticed, VI. 4, it is God and not the Devil who puts in our path: VI. 18 *Summa igitur virtus habenda patientia est, quam ut caperet homo iustus, voluit illum Deus . . . . pro inerte contemni.*—VII. 5 *Ut pro-*

poneret homini virtutem, id est, tolerantiam malorum ac laborum, per quam posset praemium immortalitatis adipisci. Epitome, § 34 *Virtus enim malorum sustinentia est.*

For God desires us to reach our prize with difficulty, VII. 5 *Excogitavit . . . . inenarrabile opus quemadmodum infinitam multitudinem crearet animarum, quas primo fragilibus et imbecillis corporibus illigatas constitueret inter bonum malumque medias, ut constantibus ex utrisque naturis virtutem proponeret, ne immortalitatem delicate assequerentur ac molliter* (see Opif. 19, interpol.) *sed ad illud aeternae vitae ineloquibile praemium summa cum difficultate ac magnis laboribus pervenirent.*

From these passages it is clear that both Lactantius and his interpolator (somewhat bolder than the original author) fix their eyes on the *moral* life of man, and in explaining the universe start therefrom. Agreeing with the Stoics in the belief that the 'good will' is alone of value (that state of mind, *ἀπάθεια, quae nec eripi cuiquam, nec transferri in alterum potest* VII. 26), they reach instinctively two necessary corollaries:—(i) This good will is purely negative, and consists in denying all the messages of sense, and defying the blows of fortune; that is, life is to be entirely ascetic and unsocial in the midst of a world, which, made by God, is yet governed by the Devil; (ii) the powerlessness of the good will here, and yet the consciousness that it alone is of worth, requires a reward in a future life, to be won with difficulty at the price of the rejection of the insidious blandishments of the present. And though they do not face the question of the Devil's happiness in Hell, it is clear that this being does not possess free-will in the sense that we do, inasmuch as he and the world he governs were created for our probation, to represent a particular temptation. The Clementines, with a somewhat subtler inquiry, finally relieve him of responsibility by showing that his *physical* conformation entails this delight, either in evil or the punishment of the wicked, and this enjoyment of darkness and fire, as his natural abode. The final

result of both authors, though it is one from which they seem to shrink, is that the world centres round personal and responsible man; that he is free to choose present or future life; and that the Lords of these two spheres are creatures and agents of God, who perform His will on the left hand and on the right, and are in a strict sense not free, for they do but execute His commands by an inherent law of their being. Such at least, if we can reduce scattered references to order, would seem to be the lesson conveyed by the Clementine writings and by the last Latin author before the Council of Nice; and if we recall the opposite views then current, *necessitarian* and *impersonal*, and remember that in course of time these views will find admission into the Christian Church itself, we shall find instruction in this honest attempt to approach *speculation* only from the *practical* point of view; to subordinate inconsistencies of result to the supreme importance of maintaining the dignity and the freedom of man the individual, and to regard the question of future life with no impartial coolness, but with a firm conviction that God is and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. But it must be allowed that in these systems the mystery of Iniquity is by no means explained, nor the personal responsibility of the prince of evil. It seems to vanish behind *physical* language, and the notion of *rebel* finally gives way to that of *accredited agent.* Yet it may be safely said that none who attempt a final solution of this insoluble problem can afford to neglect these two points, in which the merit of the pseudo-Clementines and Lactantian writings is conspicuous: a firm adherence to the *righteous* and *personal* conception of God (at least so far as *human* responsibility is concerned, in distinction to *diabolic*), and a firm belief in the *freedom* of man and his discipline by the adversity and temptation of this present life.

V.

THE STYLE AND LANGUAGE OF ST. CYPRIAN.

[E. W. Watson.]

CHAPTER I.

THE STYLE OF ST. CYPRIAN.

§ 1. Introduction and Literature. § 2. Cyprian's works. § 3. Relation to the Old Latin Bible and other translations. § 4. Comparison with Tertullian. § 5. Comparison with Apuleius. § 6. Relation to Seneca and Cicero. § 7. Poetical and Gnomic elements. § 8. Cyprian's repetitions from himself. § 9. Tropes: metaphor, metonymy, periphrasis, hyperbaton, &c. § 10. Plays upon language. § 11. Symmetry. § 12. Grammatical devices for effect. § 13. Rhythm. § 14. Rhyme. § 15. Alliteration. § 16. Parataxis. § 17. Anaphora. § 18. Asyndeton. § 19. Amplification. § 20. Figura etymologica. § 21. Conclusion.

§ 1. Some six years ago the Bishop of Salisbury suggested to Mr. H. J. White and myself that we should turn our attention to the study of St. Cyprian. The work was begun, but Mr. White soon found that his work at the Salisbury Theological College and upon the Latin Vulgate would not permit him to share it. I have therefore had to continue it alone, but not without an interest and help from the Bishop and Mr. White, which have been of the greatest service, and indeed make Salisbury one of the few places in England where patristic studies can with any convenience be pursued.

Limits of space have compelled me to omit much that is interesting. All mention of syntactical matters[1], of the forms of words, of words which occur in writers of the same

[1] There is one instance of an auxiliary verb which is so remarkable that it must not be passed over: the earliest use of *uelle* as a future auxiliary in 484. 1 *addiderunt* (*martyres*) . . . *non in hoc fidere ut liberari in praesentia uellent sed illam libertatis et securitatis aeternae gloriam cogitarent.* The

class as Cyprian, has had to be abandoned, except where they illustrate the subject of the paper. Yet I hope that I have been able in some instances to improve and elucidate the text, and that the collection of words used by Cyprian in Christian senses may do something towards making the history of Christian terminology more definite, and the account of his style and rhetoric be of interest to those who are engaged upon the same subjects in other authors.

The exact object of this paper is to describe the chief characteristics of the style of St. Cyprian, to determine his literary affinities, and to collect the most remarkable words in his vocabulary, both general and theological. In all these respects his works offer much that is interesting and important for the history of the Latin literature and language, as well as for that of the growth of Christian thought and organization.

Little has as yet been done in these respects for the study of Cyprian. The great scholars of the seventeenth century who have edited him, though all, especially Rigault and Fell, with Dodwell in his wonderful *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, have done good service, took little interest in the history of style and language. It is indeed remarkable that with their vast knowledge they should have passed over so much that is strange and striking. More may be learned from scattered notes in the works of such writers as Gronovius and Barth than from them. The progress that has been made of late has been considerable. The index to Professor von Hartel's edition in the Vienna Corpus of the Latin Fathers is in itself an admirable commentary, and the suggestions as to interpretation which it contains are indispensable to the student; but it was one of the earliest works to appear (1868–1871) in the Vienna edition, and like the rest of those first volumes it has a somewhat incomplete index. It can never be used to prove a negative, and cannot be regarded as an adequate authority for such inquiries as have been instituted by Professor Wölfflin, and now are

instance from Corippus given by Sittl, *Lokale Verschiedenheiten*, p. 128, is three hundred years later.

carried on by so many skilled colleagues of his in the *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie* and elsewhere.

Two works upon the language of Cyprian have appeared of late years. One is very short, but admirable as far as it goes; the introduction prefixed to the Abbé Léonard's edition of some of the treatises[1], which, with his editions of Minucius Felix and Tertullian's *Apology*, ought to be better known in England. But this introduction, brief as it is, is mainly devoted to syntax, and on most points of style is altogether silent. The other work, of much greater size and far less value, is by the Abbé Le Provost[2]. It shows a very slight knowledge of modern scholarship and is quite without method; words and constructions, for instance, taken from Cyprian's Biblical citations, are arranged and discussed indiscriminately among Cyprian's own. Though the book contains a good deal that is useful, especially on pp. 61 ff., where the writer notices some of Cyprian's debts to Seneca and others, it is so discursive and in places so inaccurate as to be of little service, even had the author followed a better plan and possessed a wider knowledge[3].

But the chief debt of this paper is to the *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie*, already mentioned, without the help and example of which, direct and indirect, it could not have been written. A special acknowledgement is due to Professors Wölfflin, Thielmann, and Landgraf for their work in that review and elsewhere[4]. Paucker, Rönsch, and many more

[1] *Sancti Thascii Cypriani Libri ad Don., de Mort., ad Demetr., de Bono Pat.*, édition classique . . . par l'Abbé Ferd. Léonard; Namur, 1887.

[2] *Étude philologique et littéraire sur Saint-Cyprien*, par M. Le Provost, vicaire capitulaire de Saint Brieuc et Tréguier; Saint Brieuc and Paris, 1889, 304 pp., 8vo.

[3] One of his chief aims is to prove that Cyprian's writings and the Latin Bible, which he seems to regard as one of Cyprian's works, are almost Augustan in form.

[4] I may mention that some writers in the *Archiv*—not those mentioned nor others among its leading contributors—have used Hartel's index without looking to see whether the passages cited were Cyprian's own or from Cornelius or some other writer, and that Roman words have been in consequence attributed to Africa, and other false conclusions drawn.

who have dealt with the language generally or with particular writers, are mentioned in the following pages. To them, and to others who have suggested thoughts none the less valuable that there has been no occasion to cite their words, the heartiest thanks are paid [1].

§ 2. In this paper the works of Cyprian have been regarded as a whole. Written as they were within a period of ten years, and by a man whose style had been formed before his conversion to Christianity, there was no room for development in manner. All that his religion did for him was to change his subjects and to enlarge his vocabulary. It has often been said that his letters are more carelessly written than his treatises. There is some truth in this, though there is much bad writing in the latter [2]. On the other hand Cyprian's best and most elaborate writing, rhetorical and poetical, may be found in such panegyrical orations as *Epp.* 38, 39, 40, written to be pronounced before the assembled Church of Carthage on behalf of newly ordained clergy, as

[1] Schmalz's *Stilistik* in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* has been of the greatest help. If it could be expanded to an adequate extent it might fulfil all requirements. The lines are laid down for a complete history of the growth of Latin style. Several years' continuous work have assured me more and more of the value of Georges' Lexicon. It would be ungrateful not to mention also the names of Sittl, Miodoński and Koffmane. Becker, Kretzschmann and Koziol, the writers on Apuleius, the author most akin to Cyprian in style, have been of great service. On Tertullian I have only seen the excellent paper by Kellner in the *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1876, and Kolberg's and Bonwetsch's writings.

[2] E. g. 226. 10 *constituere audet aliud altare . . . nec scire quoniam* sq., 250. 19 *ante est ut sciamus . . . tunc facere* sq., 352. 19 *dixisti per nos fieri et quod nobis debeant imputari omnia ista*, 373. 19 *nisi iterum pietas diuina subueniens iustitiae et misericordiae operibus ostensis uiam . . . aperiret*, 386. 1 *ad corroborationem fidei et dilectionem Dei*, 405. 13 *unusquisque cum nascitur . . . initium sumit a lacrimis et quamuis adhuc omnium nescius et ignarus nihil aliud nouit . . . quam flere*, 408. 18 *ut fratri in te peccanti non tantum septuagies septies sed omnia omnino peccata dimittas*, 422. 9 *Saul quoque rex ut Dauid odisset . . . quid aliud quam zeli stimulus prouocauit?* 220. 25 f., 250. 12 f., 385. 10 f., &c. Tenses are constantly confused and put in wrong sequences; 197. 14, 239. 6, 260. 3, 329. 16, 330. 20, 384. 13, 401. 1, 429. 14, &c. Indicative often in dependent clauses; 339. 18, 392. 20 f., 419. 10, &c.

Epp. 6, 10, 28 and 37, laudations of the Confessors, or *Ep.* 58 to the people of Thibaris, which Ebert[1] describes as showing the most brilliant and characteristic aspect of Cyprian's style. Such letters, if they ought to be so called, are hardly less ornate than the *Ad Donatum.* On the ground, then, of the substantial identity of Cyprian's style throughout his writings no distinction has been made between different parts of them in this paper, and all are cited simply by page and line of Hartel's edition.

All Cyprian's undoubted works are reviewed here. *Ep.* 33, of which some doubts have been expressed, has been included, though of course it can contribute little. But the *Quod Idola Dii non sint* has been excluded. There has been much discussion as to its genuineness, which there is no room to recapitulate here. It must suffice to say that its jerky style, its paucity of conjunctions, the want of any reference to it, and of any repetition of its language in other parts of Cyprian's writings, though he so constantly repeats what he regards as happy phrases, together with the use of terms which he never employs[2], have convinced me that it is not his. Yet even if the treatise be genuine, the loss to a knowledge of Cyprian through its exclusion is not great. It is a mere cento from known and perhaps unknown sources, much more clumsily compiled than Cyprian's adaptations from Tertullian[3]. In spite of the advocacy of Wölfflin and Matzinger, I have not felt justified in using the *De Spectaculis*

[1] *Litteratur des Mittelalters*, p. 63. He selects § 9 for special commendation. *Ep.* 11. § 8 is at least its equal. Goetz, *Gesch. d. Cypr. Litteratur*, Basel, 1891, gives a good collection of ancient opinions on Cyprian's excellence as an orator and writer.

[2] E. g. *altare* of a heathen altar 24. 14, *uulgus* 19. 2, 23. 11, 25. 10, 26. 18. The subject is mentioned in various notes in the following pages.

[3] Jerome's witness (*Ep.* 70. 5) is the strongest claim that *Quod Id.* has to Cyprianic authorship. But quite apart from the question of the value of Jerome's attestation, which is not too great, it is clear that spurious treatises had been fathered on Cyprian a generation earlier. Lucifer's use of the *De Laudibus Martyrii* shows that he had no doubt of its being Cyprian's work, and it has a place in the Cheltenham List. *Quod Id.* may well have no stronger claim, quite apart from internal evidence.

and *De Bono Pudicitiae* as Cyprianic [1]; but they again could not have contributed much material.

The text followed has of course been Hartel's. Little more can remain to be done for the Treatises, and the reader feels himself perfectly safe with that text [2]. But the Letters need much further investigation. There must be more meaning than has yet been discovered in the varying order of the *Epp.* in different groups of MSS., and even in MSS. closely allied, and more MSS. need to be collated [3]. But even so the changes to be made cannot be considerable.

§ 3. The most obvious characteristic of Cyprian's writings is their thoroughly rhetorical character, and their independence of Christian literary tradition. There were two considerable bodies of literature with which he might have shown affinity, the Old Latin Bible and its kindred translations from the Greek, and the writings of Tertullian. Of both his style shows independence, and of the former his constant attempt to improve upon the translators' Latin shows how little esteem he had for their work.

One cannot help being struck by the small respect which Cyprian shows for the language of his Latin Bible [4], which he quotes so constantly and so precisely. Apart from the

[1] Wölfflin on *De Spect.* in *Archiv für lat. Lex.* viii, p. 1; Matzinger, *Des hl. Cyprianus Tractat De bono Pudicitiae,* Nürnberg 1892. Each writer defends both treatises, and both can allege very strong grounds, though Matzinger's proofs seem the more convincing. But the arguments of Weyman (*Hist. Jahrbuch d. Görres Gesellschaft,* 1892), Demmler (*Theol. Quartalschrift,* 1894) and Haussleiter (*Theol. Literaturblatt,* 1894) raise serious difficulties. Their claim for Novatian of these two tracts and of *Quod Idola* is less successful than their attack on Cyprian's authorship. It seems impossible that the same pen could have written both *Quod Idola* and the other two.

[2] With the well-known exception of the *Testimonia.*

[3] Cf. Professor Sanday in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica,* III. p. 217 ff., on the Cheltenham List. On p. 299 is a table giving a partial clue to the arrangement of letters. In *Old Latin Biblical Texts* II, Appendix II, the same writer has given some account of the Oxford MSS., and shown reason for supposing them well worth further examination. I have lately collated those that seem most important.

[4] May I state my own strong conviction, for what it is worth, that there never was more than one original Old Latin version?

termini technici of Christian doctrine and discipline, and from his own diction when alluding to Scriptural, and especially Pauline, language, there is no sign of any dependence. In spite of its rich vocabulary, in some respects superior to that of the Vulgate, the Old Latin version was clumsily executed and quite modern. By his extreme care in indicating that its words are not his own (see p. 252), Cyprian seems to disclaim all responsibility for the translation which he had to use, and indeed its whole style is markedly incongruous with his own. There are a few Biblical phrases which he uses constantly and naturally, such as *accipere personas*, *ambulare in lumine*, *conuersatio*, *scandalum*, *tribulatio*. But their character shows that they were part of the common Christian vocabulary, as they had been, no doubt, before the Bible was translated into Latin[1]. But Cyprian not only, as a rhetorician, disliked the style of the Latin Bible: he was also discontented with its vocabulary. It used many Greek words; on a later page those which Cyprian retained are collected, and it will be seen with what vigour, and in some cases with what success, he strove to eject them. Indeed, the whole of the next chapter, dealing with his ecclesiastical vocabulary, is an evidence of his purism in this respect. He wrote a long letter (*Ep.* 63) upon the Eucharist, without ever using the word *eucharistia*; *daemon*, *mysterium*, and others are almost banished, and throughout his works he never uses words so common as *Paracletus*, *parabola*, *proselytus*, *neophytus*, *brauium*, though Tertullian freely used them all. The only Greek words, for which substitutes had been provided, which he constantly prefers are *baptisma*, because of heretical associations of *tinctio* (see p. 264), *presbyter*, because of the indefiniteness of *senior*, and *laicus* instead of *plebeius*. And there are few of the Greek terms of Church use for which he has not essayed to

[1] It would be interesting to know when the Latin Bible, for its own sake, became venerable in the eyes of Christians. Lactantius seems to have as little respect for it as Cyprian, and Arnobius even less. His allusions to definitely Christian matters are expressed in thoroughly unbiblical language. But in Jerome, Ambrose and Augustine a reverence for manner as well as for matter is evident.

find a Latin synonym. But it is not only Greek words which are avoided by Cyprian. He is still more averse to Hebrew. *Satan* and *Satanas*, common in Tertullian, are entirely absent. The only Hebrew word freely used is *gehenna* (374. 8, 483. 8, &c.). *Mamona*, 381. 18, *sabbatum*, 720. 2, and a few more could not be avoided[1].

But Latin words of modern or rude invention are disliked by Cyprian as much as Greek or Hebrew. The reader of the titles of the *Testimonia* finds himself in the presence of words quite different from those which Cyprian elsewhere employs; theological terms found only there or perhaps also in the carelessly written letters of the Baptismal controversy, which formed part of the original stock, but offended Cyprian's taste. Thus *saluator* only occurs *Test.* ii. 7 tit. and *saluare* only in the Baptismal letters, 790. 20, 809. 12, just as *catecumenus* is found in both *Test.* iii. 98 and 795. 16, and not elsewhere. *Saluare* was modern and probably undignified in sound; Cyprian's many substitutes for it will be found in Ch. II. The most noteworthy is the old ceremonial term of heathen worship, *sospitare*, 188. 25, 211. 9. Arnobius, 2. 74, another rhetorician, uses *sospitator* of Christ. Cyprian's use of this word, of *altare* for the *ara* of the O. L., of *uestigium* for *pes* in the Baptismal ceremony of washing and kissing the feet, for all of which see the next chapter, was no doubt part of a deliberate plan for making Christian language more stately, and so recommending the Faith.

Cyprian's extensive use of the Bible is certainly in part rhetorical. He renounced the direct citation of the classical

[1] Greek and Hebrew words are marked as alien by their not being adapted to Latin forms. The pl. and acc. of *haeresis* and *exhomologesis* should probably always be in *-is* and *-in*; cf. 227. 14, 423. 11, 524. 6, 781. 10, 800. 1, 805. 21, 806. 9; *haereseos* 772. 17; *martyras* 502. 19, &c. *Propheten* seems the normal form, as in Tertullian. Yet *agapem* 102. 5. Hebrew nouns, except those which are classical in form, as *Pharao* 328. 5, and *Daniel*, *Ezechiel*, &c., of the third declension (yet *Samuel* acc. 728. 20), are treated irregularly; e.g. *Abraham* is indeclinable 468. 19, 670. 6, 703. 19, but declined 704. 3, which, however, is Biblical. *Hierosolyma* (pl.) 660. 11, *Hierusalem* never.

writers, though he still employed them for ornamental allusions, and Scripture had to fill the place. It would be a very inadequate account of his motives to say that the *Testimonia* and *Ad Fortunatum* were composed for this end [1], but it would be easier to underestimate than to overestimate the rhetorical use made by Cyprian of his Bible, and especially of his own extracts in the *Testimonia*. The influence of this work over Christian literature for some generations after its compiler's death has probably not yet been realized. Yet when Cyprian himself is aiming at effect by means of florid diction, not by appeal to authority, he judiciously abstains from any suggestion of Biblical language.

There is some evidence that Cyprian knew Irenaeus (Harnack, *Altchristliche Literatur*, p. 267), and it may be more than an accident that the words *praefiguratio* 763. 14, and *plasma* 468. 12 should apparently occur for the first time in Irenaeus (5. 29, 2; and 1. 18, 5. 11, 2), and then in Cyprian, though not in Tertullian. But there is no evidence that he knew any other translations into Latin [2].

§ 4. Of Cyprian's dependence on Tertullian, his master according to Jerome's well-known anecdote, there can be no doubt. But it is entirely a dependence of matter, not of manner. No two styles can be more different. Tertullian is always concise, even to obscurity. His sentences, according to his own rules of art, are always well shaped; he can never be accused of carelessness. But he is the most reckless of writers in the adoption of words of vulgar life, and in their

[1] Yet cf. Haussleiter's *Cyprianstudien* in *Comment. Woelfflin*, p. 379 ff. Speaking of the *De Habitu Virginum* he says, 'Der frühere Lehrer der Beredsamkeit benutzt die Sammlung der "Zeugnisse" unter dem rhetorischen Gesichtspunkt der Topik;' and later 'Der kasuelle Anlass, die nothwendig gewordene Zurechtweisung der Virgines, bildet den Zettel des Gewebes. Den Einschlag liefern die *Testimonia* und der unerschöpfliche Tertullian. Cyprian's Arbeit beschränkte sich so auf die rhetorische Ausführung.'

[2] He may have known the Greek Irenaeus, not the Latin, which shows some signs of a later date. He certainly had a hand in the translation of *Ep.* 75, though that can only have been in improving a Latin version already made.

invention for any momentary need. Cyprian, on the other hand, attains his effect by an amplitude of expression which degenerates often enough into mere verbosity, and is guilty from time to time of a sentence so prolonged and involved that its construction is lost or obscured. Indeed, he is a very careless writer, even at his best, as regards structure. Yet he is sparing in the use of new or colloquial words, and when he employs them it is almost always to obtain some rhetorical effect. For that purpose he is not afraid to endanger his sense, as will be seen from the passages given hereafter of language forced for alliteration, rhyme, &c.[1] Few of the words which strike the reader as characteristic of Tertullian are found, except in isolated instances, in Cyprian. Oehler's index under the headings, for example, of *adsignare*, *capere*, *censeri*, *conuenire*, *deputare*, *dispungere*, *elogium*, and many more, shows words and idioms of frequent occurrence that are never, or

[1] See pp. 222, 225, &c. In 728. 11 ff. is a question lost in a string of citations. *Ep.* 41 begins with two sentences, one of twenty and the other of fifteen lines. Instances of grammatical carelessness in the Treatises have already been given on p. 192. The Letters have naturally even more errors. Some of his chief causes of confusion, beside those mentioned there, are the dependence of several clauses on one conjunction not repeated, as in 740. 9–23, where all depends on one *cum*; cf. 298. 19 ff., 744. 20 ff., and many more; clauses simply linked together without any subordination, or without any indication of the beginning of the apodosis, as 407. 22, 528. 23, 539. 9, 544. 15, 606. 13, 772. 18, &c.; double relative clauses, as 589. 10, 643. 9, 699. 13; double conditional clauses, as 754. 12, 781. 11; the use of a participle for a relative or conditional clause, as 499. 23, 518. 14, 687. 11; the use of the genitive and ablative in many eccentric senses, and other causes which can only be dealt with in a discussion of syntax. Such grammatical peculiarities as seem to be rhetorically intended are mentioned later. Beside these must be named the omission of words or prefixes through a cognate preceding as 600. 22 *in tanto fratrum religiosoque conuentu* (i.e. *tam religioso*), 628. 7 *pari grauitate et salubri moderatione* (i.e. *pariter salubri*), so perhaps also 671. 19 *talia ac tanta et multa exempla* (i.e. *tam multa*) should be read. With these may be compared ps.-Apul. *Ascl.* 8 (33. 24 Goldb.) *tantus et bonus*, Hieron. *Ep.* 48. 12 *toties et crebro*. The prefix *con-* is omitted 431. 23 *conlaetare et gratulare melioribus*, 701. 2 *collegarum et sacerdotum*; cf. Apul. *Apol.* 40 (51. 15 Kr.) *conexa et catenata*. Correlatives also are omitted occasionally, as 189. 17, 383. 24. Cyprian's mistakes usually occur near the end of his writings, and are especially common in the long controversial letters, of which he seems to have grown tired before they were finished.

most rarely, to be found in Cyprian, whose own favourite words, e.g. *blandiri*, *copulare*, *cumulare*, *grassari*, *magisterium*, *obsequium*, *proficere*, *repraesentare*, are in no wise frequent in Tertullian. The only writing of Cyprian's which seems to show signs of his master's influence in style is *Ep.* 63, certainly one of his earliest compositions. It contains such words as *taxare* and *laetificare* (705. 19, 710. 18), which he afterwards avoids. Yet a fair proportion of the few needless Greek words employed are loans from Tertullian ; cf. p. 296.

The influence of Minucius Felix on Cyprian, or rather the wholesale borrowing from him in the *Ad Don.*, and the more moderate loans elsewhere (e. g. *B. Pat.* § 3, which contains *qui non loquimur magna sed uiuimus* (398. 21) from Min. Fel. 38. 6, which in its turn probably comes from Sen. *Ep.* 26. 5 *utrum loquar fortia an sentiam*) is so obvious and well indicated already that it need not be retailed here. Their style also is very similar [1].

§ 5. Cyprian's object in such treatises as the *De Habitu Virginum* and *De Patientia* was no doubt to give his people the benefit of Tertullian's thoughts, while providing a substitute for writings which, however harmless themselves, would probably lead their readers on to Montanist works of the same author. A similar motive seems to have led Cyprian to compose the *Ad Donatum*. The philosophical writings of Apuleius, composed in that ornate style which was as pleasing to Cyprian's age as to himself, must have been a dangerous attraction to the less convinced Christians. In all probability they were written with a deliberate religious purpose ; perhaps even the *Metamorphoses* were composed by Apuleius in order to attract his readers to the Mysteries, with an ecstatic account of which he ends his book. The *Ad Donatum* appears to be a counterblast to such literature as this, probably to the very writings of Apuleius which are extant. The theory of a definite purpose of presenting Christianity in its most pleasing aspect, as a mystery initiation into which brings new

[1] If evidence be still needed of the earlier date of Minucius, I have given a small proof on p. 225.

life and joy, and presenting it vaguely, without revelation of its inward teaching, but with all the attractions of what passed for the highest eloquence, seems a better account of the work than the supposition usually entertained, that it is the crude and florid production of a new and ill-instructed convert. No stress need be laid upon the apparent autobiography which it contains; a neophyte in his first enthusiasm is the natural speaker in such a composition. It is a piece of literary workmanship, and only in that light can it be judged. Its style is no evidence that it was written soon after Cyprian's conversion. He was emphatically a man of his day, and his generation regarded such writing with admiration. Tertullian had already set the example of a Christian teacher indulging in rhetorical display, and that without any excuse of possible usefulness. The *de Pallio*, with its elaborate antitheses and assonances and all the artificial graces of the time, its *minimum* of Christianity and its adulation of the Severi, is as clearly written for the sake of words as Fronto's praises of Smoke and Dust or anything in the *Florida* of Apuleius. Cyprian had at least a serious subject, if he treated it somewhat trivially. At any moment during his episcopate the need for a rhetorical antidote to rhetorical pagan tracts may have arisen, and when the need arose his education enabled him to supply it. That his standard of taste did not change is shown by *Ep.* 76, which contains some of his most highly coloured rhetoric, written under the inspiration of approaching martyrdom within a few weeks of his death [1]. That such an indirect reply to pleas for paganism might naturally be made is shown, I think, conclusively by the *Asclepius* attributed to Apuleius. Unless I am entirely mistaken, that piece is translated from the Greek by a deliberate imitator of the writings of Cyprian. Cyprian found it necessary to show the world that Christian

[1] Against this view of the *Ad Don.* must be set Augustine's statement that it was his work as a new convert. *Doctr. Chr.* 4. 14. This, at any rate, has been the view usually taken of Augustine's meaning. But does he necessarily imply more than that *Ad Don.* stood at the beginning of his copy?

literature could be as attractive as heathen; a generation later the literary advantage was on the side of Christianity.

It would be impossible to show any direct influence of Apuleius on Cyprian, though nothing can be clearer than the fact that both had been trained in the same school of rhetoric. The writers on the style of Apuleius might, with a very small amount of change, turn their books into treatises on Cyprian. There is only one of Apuleius' devices, the use of diminutives, which is not also employed by Cyprian[1]. Apuleius, a leisurely writer aiming at nothing but effect, uses his tricks of style with much more frequency than Cyprian; yet Cyprian has them always at command, and on occasion, as in the *Ad Don.*, the perorations of most of his treatises and the panegyrical letters, can use them as lavishly as Apuleius himself[2]. The symmetrical arrangement of balanced clauses, the constant pleonasm (for Cyprian when striving to be eloquent will always use two words in preference to one), the alliteration, the rhyme, the poetical diction, the forced metaphors and combinations of incongruous words, and all the artifices of style are to be found in both[3]. Though this paper is confined

[1] *Clausula* 287. 5 and *summula* 479. 2, 701. 6 are Cyprian's only diminutives of the first declension, and they are not employed for mere effect. *Morula*, 500. 11, is not Cyprian's own, but quoted by him from the words of the recipient of a vision. Diminutives in *-culum* are fairly numerous, but only *conuenticulum* 220. 23, 683. 6 and *corpusculum* 201. 4, 761. 5 are diminutive in more than form.

[2] Kretzschmann, *De latinitate L. Apuleii*, Königsberg, 1865, p. 9 notes the excessive symmetry of Apuleius, *uix autem dici potest quam creber ac nimius fuerit Apuleius in omnibus his dictionis flosculis* (*πάρισα*, &c.) *studiose appetendis*. Kretzschmann, Becker and Koziol on Apuleius are all useful to a reader of Cyprian, if only to teach him the wide use of pleonasm in this school, and to recognize the superabundance of synonyms without trying to torture them into differences of meaning.

[3] Apuleius' quaint rhyme with adverbs in *-atim*, *Met.* 8. 15 (144. 14 Eyss.) *non laciniatim disperso sed cuneatim stipato commeatu* has an exact parallel in Cyprian 598. 21 *ostiatim per multorum domos uel oppidatim per quasdam ciuitates discurrentes*, where Cyprian has an assonance as well, and so excels his rival. What could be more Cyprianic than *Met.* 4. 19 (68. 4 Eyss.) *his omnibus salubri consilio recte dispositis*? Yet it refers to the arrangements for a burglary.

to one writer, it may be suggested that a comparison of the style of different authors with the text-books of rhetoric would cast much light on the history of education under the Empire, and might be a more certain guide to localization than the study of words, which has been pursued so vigorously of late.

§ 6. Apuleius is not the model of Cyprian; they were only trained in the same school, whatever it may have been; it was, at any rate, not that of Fronto. But Cyprian owes a direct debt to Seneca. In the next chapter (p. 291) one striking metaphor, that of the gladiator for the Christian, has been pointed out as common to both. This is only one of several thoughts which Cyprian owes to the Stoic philosophy of Seneca. As illustrations of hardship the Stoic often dilates on torture, the *eculeus*, the *laminae*, the *frons inscripta*, the wild beasts, &c., dangers which were much more real to the Christian. Hence not only the general sense of Seneca, but even turns of language are reproduced; Sen. *Dial.* 1. 4. 11, *uulnera praebere uulneribus* (Cypr. 491. 17 *torquerentur . . . iam non membra sed uulnera*; for the thought cf. *Mart. Polyc.* 12), *Ep.* 66. 18 *nihil interesse utrum aliquis in gaudio sit an in eculeo iaceat ac tortorem lasset*, *Ep.* 71. 5 *si uirtutem adamaueris quidquid illa contigerit tibi . . . faustum felixque erit; et torqueri si modo iacueris ipso torquente securior* sq.: *Dial.* 5. 3. 6, *Ep.* 14, 5, &c. (cf. Cypr. 192. 9, 491. 13, 582. 19, &c.). But Cyprian borrows from Seneca on other themes also, and his words as well as his thoughts; *Ep.* 94. 56 *properantis mundi uolubilem cursum* = Cypr. 577. 8 *reuertentis anni uolubilem circulum*, *Dial.* 5. 1. 5 *accessus lenes et incrementa fallentia*, cf. Cypr. 209. 13, 247. 26, &c., *Ep.* 83. 27 *retinere rectum tenorem* = 621. 17, 725. 9, *Dial.* 5. 1. 4 *ira praecipitat* = 225. 11 (cf. 5. 20), though this may be Virgilian, *Aen.* 2. 317; words frequent in both and similarly used are *aestuare*, *fluctuare*, *inflari*, *inconcussus*, *proficere* (of moral progress), *repraesentare*. The *Ad Don.* especially is full of reminiscences of Seneca[1].

[1] Cf. with 8. 25 *aruinae toris* sq. Sen. *Ep.* 15. 2; with 9. 1 *carius perire*,

The only other prose writer whom Cyprian evidently knew is Cicero. Though no educated writer of post-Augustan date could fail to show the influence of Cicero, yet there can be none who is less indebted to him than Cyprian. In *Ad Don.* 1 (3. 13) *dum erratici palmitum lapsus . . . repunt* there is an imitation of *De Senectute* 52, *uitis serpens multiplici lapsu et erratico*; and 668. 15 sq. suggests *contempsi Catilinae gladios.* Beside these there seem to be only little expressions which might naturally cling to the memory, such as *turbo et tempestas* 210. 17, 618. 2, *praepropera festinatio* 717. 11, *expugnator matrimonii alieni* 644. 10. Two of Cicero's words, *ingressio* 193. 15, and *impugnatio* (six times: see Hartel's index), seem to have been revived by Cyprian, after an intervening period of neglect.

§ 7. Among existing poets one cannot be sure that Cyprian knew any but Virgil. Lucretius, whom Tertullian and Lactantius know well, Arnobius too well, is never copied. *Arborei fetus* 353. 2 from *Georg.* 1. 55, *frondea tecta* 3. 14 from *Georg.* 4. 61, *furiata mens* 424. 11 from *Aen.* 2. 407, *fluctuans uario mentis aestu* 239. 13 (and 300. 16) from *Aen.* 4. 532, *bibat licet gemma* 13. 24 from *Georg.* 2. 506, *fanda atque infanda* 630. 17 from *Aen.* 1. 543, &c., and, most clearly of all, 367. 24 *quando et in agro inter cultas et fertiles segetes lolium et auena dominetur* (alluded to again 385. 9) from *Georg.* 1. 154 *interque nitentia culta Infelix lolium et steriles dominantur auenae*; probably also 577. 14 *per uicissitudines mensium transmeauit hibernum* from *Aen.* 1. 266 *ternaque transierint Rutulis hiberna subactis* (cf. p. 305, n.) are evidences that Cyprian could quote his Virgil, while 4. 8 *exilis ingenii angusta mediocritas . . . nullis ad copiam fecundi caespitis culminibus ingrauescit* from *Ecl.* 1. 68 *congestum caespite culmen* proves that he could forget or mistake his meaning. *Area fruges terit* 304. 24 recalls Tibullus 1. 5, 22 *area dum messes sole calente teret.*

Ep. 115. 8 *carius inepti.* *Ad Don.* § 12 suggests Sen. *Ep.* 115. 8 ff. and *Dial.* 1. 3, 10 ff. But cf. especially *Ad Don.* § 10 (and *Ad Dem.* §§ 10, 11) with *Dial.* 4. 7. 3, and 4. 8. 2.

But it is probable that there are also citations from Seneca's tragedies. Their language, of course, has many resemblances to that of the moral writings, and also to prose rhetoric of Cyprian's school. In no play is this so strong as in the *Hercules Oetaeus*. But 355. 23 *si terra situ pulueris squaleat* is very possibly from *Phaedr.* 471 *orbis iacebit squalido turpis situ*; cf. 830. 2 *squalent membra . . . situ et sorde deformia*, which suggests a dislocated hexameter. *Viuax flamma* 368. 16 occurs in *Med.* 826, *compage rupta* 491. 16, though in a different sense, in *Oed.* 580 (plural *Herc. Oet.* 1135, 1228) and *obductae fores* 10. 25 *Herc. Oet.* 1548. These also may be reminiscences.

There are at least two more instances of apparently hexameter lines, from unknown poets, cited indirectly; 353. 10 *nouella ac uegeta iuuenta pollere,* which suggests *uegeta pollere iuuenta;* cf. *auena dominetur* already cited, and 646. 23 *carinam praeualidis et electis roboribus intexe*, which may be from *roboribus ualidis intexe carinam*, and also one iambic *senarius* with its two last words transposed, 474. 7 *nemo diu tutus est periculo proximus*[1].

Beside these instances of actual verse, Cyprian's diction is at least as full of poetical elements as that of any post-Augustan writer. Taking only a few illustrations, and those confined to nouns, *acies*='warfare' 495. 6, 526. 15, 654. 9, 663. 23, *clades* 224. 14, 302. 28, &c., *labes* 6. 4, &c., *moles* 15. 10, &c., *sordes* (sing.) 104. 19, 830. 2, *strages* 358. 21, &c., *strues* 13. 20, *suboles* 410. 6, &c., are in form or use poetical, as are *aeuum*=*uita* 6. 3, 364. 20, *aetas*=*tempus* 780. 14, *germen* 189. 12, *gleba* 355. 24, *meta* (of a river) 7. 9, *merx* (sing.) 678. 22, *prex* (sing.) 226. 8, 247. 9, 292. 12, 408. 20, &c., *sudor*

[1] No one seems hitherto to have noticed this line. Professor J. E. B. Mayor, who recognizes that it is verse, has pointed out that the thought is in Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 326 f. *nemo se tuto diu Periculis offerre tam crebris potest*, but does not know the line itself. It is not in Wölfflin's *Publilius Syrus*. Jerome, *Ep.* 30. 14 has *nemo, ut beatus Cyprianus ait,* satis *tutus periculo proximus.* Tertullian *Natt.* I. 20 similarly transposes two words of the Hesiodic line to adapt them to prose;—*sic figulus figulo, faber fabro inuidet.*

(of a fountain) 353. 16, *conamina* 687. 15, *lumina*='eyes' 8. 24, 10. 26, *pignora*=*liberi* 388. 11, 26, &c.[1] So also with compound expressions: *classicum uocis* 317. 11, *grana pretiosa*= 'jewels' 197. 25 (not in Georges)[2], *durus ac ferreus* 239. 17, *sidus turbidum* 249. 4, *supinae manus* 330. 19, *pauperes uenae* 353. 4, *laborata monilia* 259. 14, *longaeua uita* 353. 25, *crudo tempore* 518. 20, *geminus agon* 580. 4, *candida lux* 230. 11, 369. 24, 577. 13 (also in Apuleius, *Met.* 6. 20, p. 109. 23 Eyss.), *flammis ambientibus medios* 221. 8, *lassa domus* 313. 2, *fons senectute deficiens* 353. 16, *animalia uergente situ ad terram depressa* 362. 16, and many more. The use of simple for compound verbs may also be regarded as poetical, e. g. *forare nauem* 304. 23=*perforare*, *formare*=*reformare* 402. 12, *premere* =*opprimere* 244. 21, *quaerere* 694. 8, 747. 22, *signare*=*adsignare* 15. 15, *spectare*=*expectare* 539. 11, *sternere* 362. 21, *suadere*=*persuadere* 478. 4, *sumere*=*accipere* 378. 4, 519. 16, and constantly, *tergere* 494. 5, *uertere* 218. 10.

A writer so diffuse as Cyprian could neither use nor originate many proverbial expressions. Otto, in his *Sprichwörter der Römer* and Weyman in his review of that book in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 8, p. 397, have gleaned what there is; 6. 13 *in proprias laudes odiosa iactatio est*, 13. 27 and 245. 11 *possideri magis quam possidere*, 202. 19 *non est ad magna facilis adscensus*, 419. 10 *de scintillis conflare incendia*, 421. 2 *gladio suo perimi*, 431. 20 *unde uulneratus fueras inde curare*, 505. 12 *parum est adipisci aliquid potuisse, plus est quod adeptus es posse seruare*, 617. 6 *quasi mutasse sit hominem mutare regionem*[3], are the most interesting. To these must be added *nemo diu tutus est periculo proximus* 474. 7, cited above. *Semel uincit qui statim patitur* 577. 3, is perhaps the source of the proverb *uincit qui patitur*[4].

[1] A. Funck in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 7, p. 101, states that Cyprian is the first to use *pignora* systematically as a substitute for *liberi*.

[2] Cf. Tert. *Res. Carn.* 7 *Rubentis Maris grana candentia*.

[3] This must be simply proverbial, not Horatian. There is no other possible allusion to that poet.

[4] Professor J. E. B. Mayor finds the words imbedded in the *Catonis*

§ 8. There is no source from which Cyprian draws more freely than his own writings. Phrases, and even long sentences, which he regards as effective are repeated, and this not only in hasty letters written about the same time, but also in his more elaborate productions separated by intervals of years. Felicitous expressions must have been stored up either in his memory or in his common-place book for repetition. One sentence in *Ad Don.* 3 (5. 18 ff.) *necesse est, ut solebat, uinolentia inuitet, inflet superbia, iracundia inflammet, rapacitas inquietet, crudelitas stimulet, ambitio delectet, libido praecipitet,* the alliterations and rhymes of which pleased him, is repeated with modifications in *Un.* 16, and *Mort.* 4 (225. 9, 299. 18), and reminiscences of it are found in *Dem.* 10 and *Z. L.* 6 (357. 27, 423. 6); so with *sol radiat* sq. in *Don.* 14 and *Op.* 25 (15. 11, 393. 27). The very effective conclusion of the *De Opere et Eleemosynis, in pace uincentibus coronam candidam pro operibus dabit, in persecutione pro passione geminabit,* is repeated from the end of *Ep.* 10, and the thought occurs again 577. 16. Other instances are 241. 1 *negotiationis quaestuosae nundinas aucupari*=515. 22; 239. 11 *auulsam uiscerum nostrorum partem*=521. 12; 14. 20 *adridet ut saeuiat* sq.=202. 14; 13. 13 *caducis uotis* sq.=390. 20 ff.; 35. 10 *libellus compendio breuiante digestus*=224. 2, where the sense is quite different; 101. 12 *praeceptorum grande compendium*= 287. 25; 214. 5 *fons . . . exundare . . . diffundi*=353. 15, 411. 22, and cf. 642. 15; 301. 22 *imbrem nubila serena suspendunt*= 352. 9; 351. 2 *oblatrantem te . . . et obstrepentem,* cf. 229. 13 and 602. 3 (Tert. *adu. Marc.* 2. 5 *init. O canes . . . latrantes in Deum ueritatis*). Many more instances might be given[1].

Monosticha (Riese, *Anthol. Lat.* 716. 42), *qui uinci sese patitur pro tempore uincit*, but does not know the source of the usual form. Tert. in dilating on the subject in *Apol.* 50 does not put the thought in the form of an aphorism.

[1] I think it might be shown that in some small particulars Cyprian's language varied from time to time; that *adhuc insuper, porro autem, pariter et,* and some other expressions, are only found within certain periods. This might be of use in fixing the date of some of the Treatises, which is not so well ascertained as that of the *Epp.*

§ 9. We may begin our study of the details of Cyprian's style with the rhetorical tropes[1]. Of several of these he makes little use; to others he is devoted. Of metaphorical language, especially, good and bad, his writings are full. Some of it is poetical, some scriptural in origin; perhaps none is very striking. His enemies are *lues*[2] *et pestes* 219. 1, *Patripassiani . . . et ceterae haereticorum pestes et gladii et uenena* 781. 14 (gen. of definition), and similar words are common. Other metaphors are *uarietas uitiorum* 359. 19[3]; *conlidentium uoluntatum diuortium* 215. 8; *animae tinea, cogitationum tabes, pectoris rubigo* 423. 17; *adulteria colorum* 199. 5; *in odium persecutionis facibus liuoris exarsit* 422 5 (cf. 358. 10, 424. 6); *interfector poenitentiae* 694. 4; *nubilum liuoris* 426. 6. Verbs are still more often so employed, e.g. *sopire dolorem*, &c., 685. 9[4], *oblatrantium fluctuum incursus* 667. 24, *domus iam lassa iam fatigata* 313. 2, *effossi et fatigati montes* 353. 3, *calcare carnificinam* 339. 24, *mutilare gloriam*, &c. 238. 23, 794. 10, 841. 11 (cf. *amputare* 425. 16, *castrare* 204. 3), *seminare gloriam*, &c. 577. 19, &c., *destruere castitatem, ueritatem*, &c. 420. 4, and often, *gubernandae ecclesiae libram tenentes* 744. 16, *antiqua illa contra episcopatum meum uenena retinentes* 591. 9, and many more.

Metonymy in Cyprian is almost confined to the use of abstract for concrete nouns (cf. Volkmann, *op. cit.* p. 424 n.), which is carried to an excessive degree; 652. 17 *pacem non deliciis sed armis damus*, 387. 12 *patrimonium copiosum cum indigentium paupertate communicans*, 421. 17 *alta illa sublimitas* (i.e. Satan; cf. *Quod. Id.* 8, p. 25. 14), 190. 18 *quodsi Christum continentia sequitur et regno Dei uirginitas destinatur*, 501. 18

[1] As classified by Volkmann, *Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer*, p. 415 ff. Examples could no doubt be given of others than those mentioned, but they would be in no way characteristic of Cyprian's style.

[2] Does this plural occur earlier than Tert. *An.* 30 (350. 11 Reiff.), *Apol.* 20, &c.? Cf. 352. 8.

[3] A medical metaphor; cf. *uarietas leprae* 226. 25, Sen. *N.Q.* 3. 25. 11.

[4] P. Geyer's argument from this word in Wölfflin's *Archiv* 8. 477 is spoiled by his neglect of Cyprian and Arnobius.

rogemus . . . cito latebris nostris et periculis subueniri = *latentibus et periclitantibus*. *Mediocritas nostra* = *ego*, 101. 15, &c., is very common (see p. 273); *conscientia uestra* apparently is used for *tu* 656. 16, and elsewhere. Other instances are *cum plebis inaequalitas discreparet* 497. 14, *adunationis nostrae corpus unum* 698. 21, *cum omnium baptismo communicans* 800. 2 and 805. 17, *circumuenire solitudinem singulorum* 693. 1. Abstract periphrases are constantly used for *Deus*, cf. p. 244. Cyprian makes no excessive use of collective abstracts; *fraternitas* is, of course, common; *noua fraternitas* = 'Cain and Abel' 421. 23, cf. *germanitas Thebanorum*, *Quod. Id.* 8 (25. 18); *conuiuium* = *conuiuae* 16. 11, *audientia* = *auditores* 4. 14, and others[1]. Such abstracts are not only used of persons; 600. 17 *episcopatus tui ordinationem singulorum auribus intimauimus* and the like are very frequent[2].

Here may be classed the use of concrete plurals for abstracts[3]; cf. 357. 13 *delicta mendaciorum, libidinum, fraudium, crudelitatis, impietatis, furoris*, where they are combined with singular abstracts, 510. 2 *gubernacula ecclesiae* = *gubernatio*, 674. 2 *naufragia*, 728. 4 *mens praua et fallax lingua et odia uenenata et sacrilega mendacia*, and many more. Conversely, plural abstracts in a concrete sense are common: *laudes*, *uirtutes*, *gloriae*, as in classical writers.

But Cyprian also frequently changes the meaning of words at his own convenience. *Formido* = 'object of fear' 209. 10 is classical; but he ventures on *discrimen* for *trutina* 218. 18

[1] Cyprian falls far short of other Christian writers; *Vita* 5 (A. xcv. 24) *per omnes aditus sollicita caritas circuibat*; Firm. Mat. *Err.* 27. 3 *ut his omnibus* (sc. *typis*) *quasi per gradus quosdam ad lignum crucis salus hominum perueniret* = οἱ σωζόμενοι; Victor Vit. 1. 25, &c.

[2] Abstracts with a genitive are constantly employed; *ueritas* grows quite monotonous, used as it is in 779. 8 *sanctificandi salutaris aquae ueritate*; cf. 223. 16, 305. 13, 341. 11, 379. 23, &c.; so *fides* often, e.g. 660. 9 *fide deuotionis* = *deuotione fideli*. A characteristic example is 211. 18 *quos detinere non potest in uiae ueteris caecitate circumscribit et decipit noui itineris errore*. Other good instances are 337. 1, 424. 10, 631. 23, 675. 15, 780. 22.

[3] Cf. Wölfflin in his *Archiv*, 5. 492, for instances from *De Aleatt.* So in Hieron. *Ep.* 69. 3 *effusio sanguinis et instar suis in omni caeno libidinis uolutabra* = *uolutatio*.

(cf. *examen* 528. 4, 665. 7), *simultas*='quarrelsomeness' 409. 1, *tenacitas ac firmitas* parallel with *uinculum* and *fundamentum* 407. 26, and conversely *firmamentum* for *firmitas* 489. 10, *conluuio* for *inquinatio* 644. 12, *facinus* for 'guilt' (not 'crime') 679. 20[1]. Instances of verbs with forced and unusual meanings are also common; see *perstringere, praestringere, perstrepere, praestruere* in Hartel's index, *promittere* 493. 10, 594. 4, *proruere* 528. 15, 598. 10, *occurrere*=*succurrere* 523. 19, *subducere* 8. 11, and many more. He delights in devising new shades of meaning, giving a personal subject or object to a verb never so used before, or otherwise showing his ingenuity[2].

Periphrasis is excessively common. Cyprian's devotion to abstract nouns marks his style off from that of the classical writers, and often even impedes his sense, as in 517. 4, 571. 14, 600. 1, 656. 14, 743. 17. *Cremabit addictos ardens semper gehenna et uiuacibus flammis uorax poena* 368. 16, combines pleonasm with periphrasis; cf. *uermium edax poena* = *uermes* 410. 9. Another curious periphrasis is 243. 21 *cui enim non nascenti adque morienti relinquenda quandoque patria?* where *nascens adque moriens* is put for *mortalis*. A periphrastic use of *circa* is as common in Cyprian as in other late writers, 478. 12, 616. 18, 674. 2, &c.

Hendiadys is not very common except with verbs; *properare et uenire*=*properanter* 509. 13, *cum ad me litteras direxerint et petierint*=*petentes* 519. 14, *cum manna deflueret et . . . ostenderet* 763. 14, and the like. The substantives come rather under the head of amplification or extension of meaning, as 402. 8 *crudelitas necis et effusio sanguinis*, 259. 15 *indumenta peregrina et sericas uestes*, 577. 6, 710. 14, &c., many of which are cited in § 19.

[1] *Facinus* represents ἀνομία in Mt. 24. 12 in Cyprian's Bible, 335. 18; Vulg. *iniquitas*. Jerome has only allowed the word to survive in three cases in the Vulgate; all of these are in the usual sense.

[2] So with adjectives; *succincta diligentia* 101. 9, *delicata congressio* 202. 17, and others which normally would be used of persons, not of abstractions.

Of hyperbaton there is one remarkable form, found also in Apuleius[1], by which one of two co-ordinate words is separated by a copula from those which qualify or agree with it; 524. 2 *incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo* = *incommodo et periculo infirmitatis*, 603. 1 *supersederunt et ad nos redire noluerunt*[2], 614. 10 *perfidiae et haereticae prauitatis*, 660. 14 *proclamantes et fidem suam per haec uerba testantes*, 518. 16, 538. 4, 670. 17, 768. 22, 795. 4[3].

Cyprian often displaces his words, sometimes with awkward results, though there can be no doubt that he does it deliberately. Dependent words are frequently pushed to the front, as in the very clumsy instance, 627. 13 *secundum quod tamen ante fuerat destinatum, persecutione sopita cum data esset facultas in unum conueniendi, copiosus episcoporum numerus*[4] sq.; cf. 740. 3 *obrepere autem si hominibus Basilides potuit, Deo non potest*, which may be excused by epiploce with the preceding *obrepsit*, 368. 20, 404. 24, 411. 4, 789. 14 (where *et qui* = *qui et*), &c. *Esse* especially is often prefixed; 387. 21 *quo amplior fuerit pignorum copia esse et operum debet maior inpensa*, 5. 15, 398. 23, 623. 4, &c. In 243. 21 obscurity is caused not only by a strange periphrasis but by the putting of *non* before its natural place; cf. 514. 16. *Quid* clauses are usually dislocated; 200. 1 *uiderint quid sibi nuptae blandiantur*

[1] *Met.* 6. 31 (118. 16 Eyss.) *ultra modum delictique saeuire terminum* = *modum terminumque delicti*; *Plat.* 1. 15 (77. 7 Goldb.) *pulmones loco ac sui genere cordi plurimum consulunt* = *loco ac genere*; and perhaps elsewhere. It is an imitation of such poetical licence as Hor. *Carm.* 3. 4. 11 *ludo fatigatumque somno*, Tibullus 1. 3. 56, &c.

[2] To take this as hyperbaton for *supersederunt et noluerunt redire* seems more reasonable than with Hartel (Preface, p. liii) to appeal to an unattested statement of Nonius that the verb *supersedere* may mean 'to be obstinate.' Rönsch, *Beitr.* 3, p. 80 agrees with Hartel.

[3] So also in other writers among Cyprian's *Epp.* In 552. 8 (Novatian) the MSS. read *tenorem euangelici uigoris inlibatam dignitatem seruare.* Hartel reads *tenore*, but *tenorem et* is at least as near to the MSS., and quite possible according to this idiom. So Cornelius (613. 15) *malitia et inexplebili auaritia*, and Nemesianus (835. 3) where, for the MS. *ut . . . cadauera* (or *cadaueris*) *ipsius publici hostis nerui concisi calcarentur*, *cadauer et* should probably be read, instead of *et* being inserted after *hostis*, as by Hartel.

[4] This separation by a genitive of noun and adjective is rare in Cyprian.

sq., 209. 4, 299. 10, 373. 18, &c.; cf. the extraordinary *quae cum uiris adque uiros* sq., 200. 25. *Prius longe quam* 498. 18, *multum malitia protracta* 399. 18 (cf. 424. 22), and the like, occasionally occur.

Adverbs and conjunctions are often put unnaturally late in the sentence. *Namque* is third 651. 17, 735. 23, *etenim* third 771. 8, *utique* fourth 727. 12. *Et* also is often displaced, occurring once in the sixth place, 698. 21. Such arrangements as 264. 8 *quam contristauerat nuper laetam faciet ecclesiam*, 318. 13 *si confectam et paratam iam uestem darem*, 507. 23 *post confessionem sanctificata et inlustrata plus membra*, 578. 21 *in carne adhuc licet uobis positis*, are common[1].

§ 10. Cyprian does not furnish many examples of playing upon language. Verbs are sometimes used in two senses; e.g. 383. 17 *seruas pecuniam quae te seruata non seruat*, 403. 5 *si admissum facinus agnoscant . . . ad praemium regni caelestis admittit*, 466. 4 *sed aliis terram colentibus illa* (sc. *leuitica tribus*) *tantum Deum coleret*, 688. 21 *ut . . . magis petant fundi pro se preces adque orationes antistitis quam ipsi fundant sanguinem sacerdotis*, 711. 12 *nos omnes portabat Christus qui et peccata nostra portabat*[2]. So with substantives; 402. 14 *ut . . . palmis in faciem uerberaretur qui palmas ueras uincentibus tribuit*; cf. 724. 18 *si uero apud insanos furor insanabilis perseuerauerit*, and 616. 10 *Nouatiani et Nouati nouas . . . machinas*, which never recurs, obvious though it is. Perhaps the only instances of oxymoron are *grande conpendium* 110. 12, 287. 25 (cf. Aug. *C. D.* 4. 21 *magnum conpendium*), *magna et diuina breuitas* 288. 1, *fetus sterilis*, *nubila serena* 301. 20, 22. Cyprian indulges in few conceits; 582. 21 the confessors' feet are bound,

[1] Examples of tropical language not so often used by Cyprian are, (1) the proleptic use of adjectives 13. 11, 353. 25, 378. 15, 741. 12; (2) litotes, only in such mild expressions as *non facile* = *nequaquam* 320. 1, and often, and similarly *minus*, *minime* and a few more; (3) hyperbole 239. 11 *auulsam uiscerum nostrorum partem* (repeated 521. 12, and perhaps suggested by Hor. *Carm.* 2. 17. 5), 491. 17, 528. 5, 679. 23; (4) brachylogy, such as is classed by Volkmann (p. 423) under synecdoche, 217. 25, 427. 3, &c.

[2] Ordinary zeugma is common enough in Cyprian; 481. 6, 693. 6, &c.

yet they are trampling on the serpent[1] (cf. 619. 6), 710. 21 wine changed to water, 829. 10 gold carried to the mine.

§ 11. Nothing is more characteristic of Cyprian than his striving after symmetry in the formation of his periods. Of parisosis many examples must necessarily be given in illustration of other figures, and therefore few are given here; 313. 25 *qualis illic caelestium regnorum uoluptas sine timore moriendi, et cum aeternitate uiuendi quam summa et perpetua felicitas*, where it is combined with rhyme, antithesis and chiastic arrangement[2], 491. 10 *uidit admirans praesentium multitudo caeleste certamen Dei et spiritale proelium Christi, stetisse seruos eius uoce libera, mente incorrupta, uirtute diuina, telis quidem saecularibus nudos, sed armis fidei credentis armatos*, where there are two short instances of parisosis, *Dei, Christi* being inserted to fill out the one, and *credentis* to complete the other, 365. 18 *exultant semper in Domino et laetantur et gaudent in Deo suo, et mala adque aduersa mundi fortiter tolerant, dum bona et prospera futura prospectant*, 740. 1, &c. In the concluding section of *Ad Dem.*, 370. 15–22, there is a succession of six groups of clauses, arranged by two, three and four, of nearly equal length[3]. Indeed, Cyprian constantly for the purpose of balance inserts otiose words; many of the instances cited under the head of amplification are due to this desire rather than to a simple preference for two words instead of one; cf. 201. 10 *simul cum amictu uestis honor corporis . . . ponitur*, 311. 11 *uenturus ad Christi sedem, ad regnorum caelestium claritatem lugere non debet et plangere, sed potius secundum pollicitationem Domini, secundum fidem ueri in profectione hac sua et translatione gaudere*, where *secundum fidem ueri*, whatever it may mean[4], is simply inserted to increase

[1] Reading *calcatus* instead of *galeatus*; cf. p. 213 n.

[2] Chiasmus is very common, e.g. 198. 22, 204. 17, 390. 22, 694. 3. It is, of course, often combined with other figures, under which examples occur.

[3] This equivalence makes Hartel's conjecture of a lacuna in line 17 unlikely. It is also probable that *patri* was meant to rhyme with *caelesti*, as *crucis* rhymes with *sanguinis* just before.

[4] Cf. *Fragm. Iuris Vat.* § 282; it seems to represent Cyprian's common *fides ueritatis* = *fides uera*.

the number of pairs to four. Other examples are 421. 11, 580. 11, 598. 19 ff., in all of which words appear to be added in order to make one clause equal in length to another.

One of the worst and most constant features of Cyprian's style is the monotonous arrangement of his words in twos and threes. Of the former many instances must be given hereafter under amplification; but even when he is not filling out his sentences with synonyms he is equally careful to save his words from standing alone; cf. 237. 17 *adest militum Christi cors candida qui persecutionis urgentis ferociam turbulentam stabili congressione fugerunt, parati ad patientiam carceris, armati ad tolerantiam mortis*, where four substantives are provided with adjectives, and all is followed by a pair of symmetrical rhyming clauses. These again are followed by three rhyming clauses of equal length. Similarly 364. 7 *per ipsa quae uos cruciant et fatigant probari et corroborari nos scimus et fidimus*, and 682. 14, where, to complete the symmetry, mere pleonasm, such as *poenas aeternas et supplicia perpetua*, is admitted. For other examples of this love of pairs of words see p. 230.

Though it not so easy to arrange words in threes as in pairs, Cyprian very frequently does it. Beside other instances given in this paper, such passages as 493. 3. 523, 4 (where *et confessorum praesentiam*, in form if not in substance, seems due to this desire), 587. 11, 663. 23, 668. 12, 712. 8, are strong evidence for the use even where the reading is somewhat doubtful, as in 582. 22 and 746. 11 [1]. The third co-ordinate word or phrase is often loaded for emphasis; 669. 9 *exaltatio et inflatio et adrogans ac superba iactatio*, 689. 2 *nullus Dei sacerdos*

[1] In 582. 22 Hartel reads *et quamuis ligati neruo pedes essent, galeatus serpens et obtritus et uictus est*. But the MS. evidence is strong for *calcatus* and against *galeatus*, which is only read by *P*, *qui plurima coniecturis peringeniosis uexauit* (Hartel, Pref. p. xxxiii). *Calcare* and *obterere* are combined again in 428. 9 and 664. 20. In the last passage is a play upon the words *calciati* and *calcari*; here upon the *ligati pedes*, which yet are free. In 746. 11 *ubi sit tutus accessus et salutaris introitus et statio secura* the evidence is divided, in a badly attested letter, between the insertion and omission of *accessus*. Hartel brackets the word, but in a doubtful case Cyprian's usage is sufficient to turn the scale in its favour, as also in 646. 20.

sic infirmus est, sic iacens et abiectus, sic inbecillitate humanae mediocritatis inualidus qui sq., 422. 10 *innocentem, misericordem, miti lenitate patientem,* 243. 16, 390. 21, 505. 24, 681. 14, &c. Even a sixfold combination occurs, as in 687. 19, 730. 10. Many triple rhymes and pleonasms will be found in §§ 14, 16

Cyprian's range of subjects naturally led him often to contrast truth with error; but the opportunities for symmetrical arrangement which antithesis gives had perhaps quite as much to do with his devotion to that figure. Antithesis real and unreal, combined usually with parisosis or other figures, abounds in his pages. *Ep.* 38, especially, contains little else. Such strings as 806. 5 *succumbat et cedat ecclesia haereticis, lux tenebris, fides perfidiae, spes desperationi, ratio errori, immortalitas morti, caritas odio, ueritas mendacio, Christus antichristo,* are very common; cf. *Fort.* 6 *tit.*, 593. 18, 687. 19, 773. 5, &c.

This love of symmetry is clearly manifested in numerous abrupt changes of voice in the verbs. In order to gain apparent uniformity the subject is violently altered and a passive introduced in the second half of a sentence, the first half of which has had a deponent verb; e.g. 402. 24 ff. *ille non loquitur nec mouetur nec maiestatem suam sub ipsa saltim passione profitetur; usque ad finem perseueranter ac iugiter tolerantur omnia ut consummetur in Christo plena et perfecta patientia,* 410. 13 ff., 423. 10 ff., &c. Conversely, the first clause is made to adjust itself to the second, 276. 24, &c.

§ 12. Certain grammatical devices are also freely used for rhetorical purposes. One of the most frequent is the use of plural abstracts, which is also characteristic of Apuleius (Koziol, p. 251). Instances are *acerbationes* 600. 21, *administrationes* 629. 9, *anxietates* 405. 16, *confessiones* 481. 3, *conflictationes* 299. 11, and often, *conluctationes* 405. 23, *conspectus* 237. 15, *dignationes* (acts of favour) 500. 13, &c., *infestationes* 406. 4, 501. 11, *meditationes* 430. 14, *miserationes* 379. 24 (also Bibl.), *postulationes* 319. 12, *tarditates* 318. 25, *ultiones* 363. 8, 366. 10 (Bibl.).

Here may also be placed the use of verbal nouns as attributes, which is very common, e.g. *desertor adsecla* 13. 11, *expugnator inimicus* 201. 18 (where *inimicus* is the substantive, cf. *subtilis inimicus* 249. 10), *inpium et persecutorem* (*fratrem*) 404. 8, and especially *peccator*, as *peccator populus* 273. 25, cf. 641. 7, 670. 5, 769. 2, &c. Cyprian extends this attributive use to substantives of other forms, as 3. 14 *baiulae arundines*, 13. 7 *comes pompa* (cf. 401. 10), 360. 24 *index uox*, 581. 12 *martyr lector*, 724. 6 *superstes crapula*. In this respect Tertullian (cf. Sittl, *Lokale Verschiedenheiten*, p. 110) far exceeds Cyprian, and Ambrose again leaves Tertullian in the rear [1].

As in other third century writers [2] derivative adjectives constantly take the place of a subjective or objective genitive, and even of a prepositional expression. *Dominicus* and *ecclesiasticus* especially are so used, e.g. 642. 23 *ecclesiasticum corpus*, 621. 5 *litteris ... quas ad me de uestra regressione et de ecclesiastica pace ac fraterna redintegratione fecistis*, where the aim is uniformity, 319. 15, 656. 21, and often *dominica confessio* (by the martyrs), 309. 19 *arcessitio dominica* (cf. *Pass. Perp.* 18 *fin. dominicae passiones*), 390. 1, 699. 15 *nummaria cupiditas, quantitas*, 652. 5 *saturitas dominica* (bestowed by the Lord), 204. 5 *diuinum munus et patrium = Dei Patris*, 411. 8 *caput bubulum*, the last being a loan from Tertullian *Jud.* 1.

Present participles, often of verbs which Cyprian uses in no other form, and in senses which cannot be distinguished from those of an adjective, are very common, e.g. *adulantia blandimenta* 247. 11, *angentes fortunae, iniuriae*, &c., 14. 3, 301. 5, 412. 15, 657. 22, 710. 17, *discordans et dissidens* 285. 16,

[1] It may be noticed that though Cyprian, like other writers after Livy, uses substantives in *-tor* to express a single act as well as a state or quality (cf. Schmalz, *Stilistik*, § 2 in Iwan-Müller's *Handbuch*), he is very sparing of such use; 379. 8, 644. 10, 734. 13, and a few more.

[2] E.g. Apuleius, see Koziol, p. 255; cf. Hildebrand's note to Arnobius, p. 449, and Zink on Fulgentius Myth. Other writers on late Latin authors make the same remark. Perhaps Arnobius goes furthest in this direction.

discrepans 602. 7, *exundans* 214. 6, 353. 15, 411. 23, *fallens* 247. 26, 360. 21, 421. 1, *ferociens* 7. 16, 484. 10, 630. 22, *frustrans* 13. 15, 390. 23, *incursans* 8. 5, 356. 25, 625. 6, *lenocinans* 198. 21, *multiplicans* 241. 3, *oblectans* 4. 1; cf. Léonard's Introduction, § 36. Such participles are often joined with an adjective; 407. 1, 507. 2, 629. 3, &c.

The neuter plural of adjectives, with or without a genitive following, is also a favourite usage; *aduersa mundi* 363. 22, 431. 2, *extrema mortis* 724. 16, *secreta et abdita mentis* 383. 13, *arcana cordis atque abdita* 653. 6 (cf. 257. 12, 268. 26, 423. 5, 563. 13 (Roman), Thielmann in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 3. 490), *occidua* 353. 11, *caelestia* = *caelum* 204. 4 (for *superna* in the same sense see p. 285), *amatoria* 195. 17, *canora musica* 420. 5 (cf. Apul. *Plat.* 1. 1, 64. 3, Goldbacher), *serena longa* 352. 9, &c.

Cyprian is very moderate in the combination of different degrees of comparison. Superlative is followed by positive in 239. 10 *maximas eximiasque uirtutes*, 313. 26 *quam summa et perpetua felicitas*, 477. 13 *summus et magnus fructus*, 672. 14 *summa et magna*; conversely, 394. 4 *quam grandis et summa laetitia;* superlative by comparative 288. 5 *praecepta prima et maiora*, cf. 339. 2; comparative by positive 191. 11 *meliora et diuina*, 468. 16 *frugaliores et innocentes cibi*. Similar irregularities are 222. 7 *inexpiabilis et grauis culpa*, 293. 17, 504. 17 (cf. 303. 19) *frequenter ac semper*, 576. 9 *satis ac plurimum*, 687. 2 *castra inuicta et fortia*, 754. 16 *quam sine spe sint et perditionem sibi maximam . . . adquirant* sq. It will be seen that most of these are legitimate; and it must be remembered that the irregular superlative had practically become positive. Comparative adjectives and adverbs, as in other late writers, are constantly used indefinitely or as equivalent to superlatives. There are nine instances in the short *Ad Don.*; cf. 104. 31, 313. 5, 483. 11, 603. 8, &c.

The Greek attraction of the relative, and the merging of the antecedent in it, is also common. This attempt at conciseness sometimes leads to obscurity, as in 582. 6, where the subject to

cui plus licuit et coegit is *ecclesia* [1], the *et* marking the apodosis; cf. 282. 7, 287. 15, 306. 2, 386. 18, &c. *Secundum quod* is especially common in citations, 285. 17, &c. Hartel's Index is far from exhausting the instances.

Certain other usages are adopted for rhetorical purposes, especially the historical infinitive, which is found five times, 6. 6, 217. 20, 240. 21, 242. 14, 255. 12. Among these are both descriptive and narrative passages. The employment also of *ut* clauses in many and often strange senses [2], consecutive, explanatory or other, as 195. 23, 569. 13, 678. 12, &c., of *quod* clauses as 320. 17 *ne . . . perdant quod euaserint* (repeated 501. 2), 664. 1 *ne perdat integer quod nuper stetit*, 202. 22, 298. 18, 403. 25, &c., in some of which *quod* may be a relative and object to the verb, as in 769. 14 *consentire in id quod illi baptizauerint* [3], seems often to be dictated by rhetorical motives.

Hypallage, sometimes bold enough, is not uncommon. Instances are 202. 26 *magna uos merces habet*, 576. 12 *uestris cordibus adhaeremus* = 'you love us,' 716. 6 *quod furtum et adulterium ne in nos etiam cadat cauere sollicite . . . debemus*, 195. 8 *patrimonio tuo Deum faenera* (repeated 263. 8, 386. 11), 584. 25 *presbyterii honorem designasse nos illis sciatis*, 682. 5 *exarmatur fides militantis populi.*

§ 13. Nothing shows the rhetorical training of Cyprian better than his use of rhythm, rhyme, and alliteration. Rhythm, even more than the others, displays this. In this respect the *Ad Donatum*, Cyprian's most rhetorical writing, shows just the same results on examination as his other Treatises and the Letters. Taking the ends of periods (including in them the words preceding a colon) we find that six forms all but exhaust the list. There are 150 of these

[1] The period should surely be placed after *suadentibus*. *Nobis suadentibus cui plus licuit* for 'the Church which had greater rights over him than I who was urging him' is not only harsh but unlike Cyprian.

[2] Though not often final; *ad hoc . . . ut* or some further definition is usual.

[3] Cf. Ambr. *Ep.* 63. 9 *perdiderunt utique quod ieiunauerunt, perdiderunt quod se aliquo continuerunt tempore.*

terminations. Of these fifty-five are of the form ⏖ ⏑ | – – ⏓ (*tectā fecerunt*, *gerere festinant*, *amoena consentit*, &c.), and forty-five are trisyllabic in their ending, nine terminate with a monosyllable followed by a word of two syllables (*ex uobis*, *hanc sedem*, &c.), and one with three monosyllables (*usus est*, *ars est*)[1]. A tribrach is only used five times before the final trisyllable; the usual trochee is much more often a whole word than a termination. The next terminal rhythm in number is – ⏑ – ⏑, of which there are twenty-seven instances, only four of which are vitiated by a long syllable at the end. Twenty are formed by one word (*sortiatur*, &c.), six by two words, the first a monosyllable (*et fauebam* 6. 2, where the *et* is put out of place for the purpose, *non timetur*, &c.), only two by dissyllables (*saepe mecum*). Then follows – ⏑ – | – ⏑ ⏓ with twenty-two examples (*amore quo diligis*, *conuiuium sobrium*), of which seven have the last syllable long, and two the first resolved into two short (*iudicia praenoscimus*, *adsidua uel lectio*). Twelve have a trisyllabic word at the end, five one of four syllables (*poenitenda contagia*, &c.), and the rest two words (*iura proscripta sint*, *singuli crimen est*, &c.). Then comes – ⏑ | ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑, that *esse uideatur* ending which Quintilian (9. 4. 73, 10. 2. 18) complains of as hackneyed. Of these there are fourteen, all but one (*damnare quod eramus*) ending in a four-syllabled word, and only one (*donantur alieni*) having its final syllable long. Then comes – ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ (*ueritate simplicia*, *pectus et pateat*, &c.) with twelve instances, eight ending in a four-syllabled word, and five with a long syllable, and finally twelve of ⏑ – – ⏑ (*reuelabo*, *recensere*, *facit mecum*, *pauor nullus*, &c.) with five examples of a word of four syllables, five with two words, and one (*elaboratam*) extending beyond the termination. The six terminations account for 137 of the 150 cases, in 105 of which the last word is of the quantitative value of – – ⏑ at least. Only thirteen cannot be accounted for under these six heads.

[1] For two monosyllables regarded as equivalent to a dissyllable cf. Bährens' Preface to *Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. 1, p. xii.

In the *De Lapsis*, not quite so carefully written, out of 262 endings all but twenty-eight fall under the same six heads. Nearly a third, eighty-one, are of the form ⏖ ⏑ | – – ⏓, sixty of – ⏑ – ⏑, twenty-eight of – ⏑ – | – ⏑ ⏓, twenty of – ⏑ | ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑, sixteen of – ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓, and twenty-nine of ⏑ – – ⏑[1].

In the *De Bono Patientiae*, more carefully written than the *De Lapsis*, of 123 terminations all but seventeen come under the above heads; thirty-two under the first, twenty-five under the second, fourteen (of which seven are of the resolved form – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏓ as *uera patientia, fecit in origine*) under the third, thirteen under the fourth, nine under the fifth, and thirteen under the last. Of the remaining seventeen, seven are of a form rare in *Ad Don.* and *De Lapsis*, that of – ⏑ – | – –, as *actibus nostris, benignius dici.*

Taking next six of the most rhetorical Epistles, 10, 28, 37, 38, 39, 58, together, the result is found to be much the same. Of 192 terminations all but twenty come under the six heads, the numbers belonging to which are respectively 56, 40, 23 (four in the resolved form), 16, 7, and 30.

It may be sufficient to take two more letters, both long ones, *Ep.* 59 to Cornelius, denouncing Novatian's party, and the controversial *Ep.* 73 to Jubaianus on Baptism. In the former, which contains 118 terminations, the numbers of the

[1] It will be seen that there are comparatively few of the more difficult forms. Of the first form, twenty-eight are of two complete words, as *mundus eluxit* and forty-three have the first word longer. In ten the first is, or ends with, a tribrach. In eight two words (*iacere me credo,* &c.) are employed to form the final molossus. Two are formed of one word, *nuntiauerunt, praedicauerunt*, and in one, *et rogauerunt* (242. 17), the *et* is put out of its place to secure this ending. Of the second form forty-two are words of four syllables (fifteen with the final long), sixteen have a monosyllable first (*ut periret,* &c.) and two are of two dissyllables. Of the third form sixteen end with four-syllabled words; the others are of three or compound tenses; there should be added one of the form – ⏑ | ⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ (*sponte properauimus*). Of the *esse uideatur* form all end with words of four syllables. Of the fifth form all except three ending with three-syllabled words (*communicare se simulant,* &c.) end with words of four. Of the twenty-nine of the last form, twenty-two are of four syllables and seven of two dissyllabic words; seven have the final long.

different forms are 22, 28, 18, 5, 11, 11. These with seven of – ᴗ – | – –, mentioned as also fairly numerous in *De B. Pat.*, and sixteen irregular, make up the whole number. In *Ep.* 73, written, like all those on the same subject, with less regard to form than Cyprian's other works, the numbers among 123 terminations are 23, 22, 18, 8, 7, 15. Among the large proportion of thirty exceptions are many of four long syllables (*baptizari*, &c.), which hardly occur in those previously analyzed[1].

Little would be gained by going through more of Cyprian's writings[2]; the results would be the same. He had no doubt been trained so effectually that his sentences, however hastily written, instinctively ended with one of the forms already mentioned. Very rarely does he end with a short word, except when two combine to form one of these terminations; hardly ever is there a hexametrical ending.

Cyprian's care for rhythmical endings can clearly be seen in the varying forms of such words as *contagium* with its alternative *contagio*. The former, which is the normal form of the third century, is used twenty-four times, the latter fourteen times, often demonstrably, as in 203. 14 *contagione transitis* and 829. 15 *contagione maculetur*, to produce a rhythmical effect which the other would not have given. A more remarkable instance is *saepe*. *Frequenter* is the normal word for 'often' throughout Cyprian; *saepe* is never used except for rhythm[4], terminal or other, and is comparatively rare.

[1] Without going through the particulars as fully as in *Ad Don.* and *De Laps.* it may be mentioned that in *De Pat.* the terminations are unusually harmonious and perfect. The same may be said of the six rhetorical letters. Among other signs of Cyprian's comparative indifference to the styles of *Epp.* 58 and 73, and others like them, is the rarity of the *esse uideatur* ending, and the greater number (in *Ep.* 73 nearly 25 per cent.) of irregular endings.

[2] Yet an occasional emendation might result, as in 779. 2, where *quaerente rescripserim*, for which there is some authority, is much more in Cyprian's style than the better attested *quaerenti* of Hartel's text, and in 483. 10, 633. 14, 711. 22, where *perseuerent*, *multa diuersitas*, *dilectio* should be read.

[4] 5. 21, 251. 4, 260. 13, 422. 10, 435. 14, 475. 21, 569. 19, 576. 8, 629. 10, 764. 16, 765. 9, and perhaps a few more times.

The solitary instance of *fateri* for *confiteri* is due to rhythm, *ut . . . Christum uictrix lingua fateatur* 665. 1[1]. All these Cyprianic terminations are usual enough in classical writers, and are among those approved by Quintilian, 9. 4. 93 ff.[2]

§ 14. Rhyme, though only of a few types, is common in Cyprian. Within the same clause such rhymes as 405. 12 *cum sudore et labore*, 593. 7 *amore et ardore*, 793. 4 *pudorem eius et honorem*, 602. 13 *nouitate uel prauitate*, 229. 26 *sanctitas et dignitas*, 320. 11 *diuitias et delicias*, 693. 7 *malitia et saeuitia*[3], 314. 2 *gloriam et uictoriam*, 742. 4 *nec annis nec minis*, 248. 16 *contumacibus et peruicacibus*, 748. 4 *execrabiles et detestabiles*, 765. 7 *laudabiles ac probabiles*, 420. 11 *exerte adque aperte*, are frequent[4]; cf. 6. 14 *quamuis non iactatum possit esse sed gratum*, 255. 22 *tanta est potestas Domini, tanta maiestas*, 267. 3 *fundamenta aedificandae spei, firmamenta conroborandae fidei*, a good example of parisosis, 390. 22, and many more. It is also combined with other figures; 239. 22 *integritas propria et sanitas priuata*, 664. 3 *integros honor, lapsos dolor ad praemium prouocet.* Longer examples often occur, as 204. 17 *hanc imaginem uirginitas portat, portat integritas, sanctitas portat et ueritas, portant* sq.; in 305. 6 and 749. 9 are three nouns of the same form; cf. 424. 8, 694. 4.

Rhymes at the end of parallel clauses are also common;

[1] *Conpago* 231. 10, 642. 24, *conpages* 5. 8, 197. 20, 226. 14, 304. 23, 491. 16, 712. 6, *adfectus, adfectio*; *consensus, consensio*, and other alternatives may be accounted for in the same way.

[2] In *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1893, is an important paper by W. Meyer on rhythm in later Latin. He only makes one incidental mention of Quintilian, appearing to hold that a complete revolution took place in the second century, and that earlier writers need not be taken into account. His examples of quantitative rhythm are taken from Cyprian. The analysis is admirable, but too elaborate and even artificial, making no allowance for exceptions. His theory of the pervading cretic serves well for the grouping of instances; but Cyprian's final cretic is usually a dactyl, and he loves to end with a molossus.

[3] Cf. *malitia et nequitia* 1 Cor. 5. 8 in Cyprian's Bible (125. 16) as well as in the Vulgate.

[4] Similarly in 794. 4 I would read *non putant se alternis immo aeternis peccatis communicare.* The *alienis* of the MSS. is pointless, and *immo* points to a play on words, as in 279. 7.

261. 17 *iniuste sibi placentes et transpunctae mentis alienatione dementes*, 382. 22 *cogitatio . . . meditatio*, 357. 25 *peccatur . . . placeatur*, 370. 18, 390. 26, 432. 14, &c.; cf. 277. 25 *iniuriam facere non nosse et factam posse tolerare*, where *posse* is displaced from the end to get the *esse uideatur* rhythm. In 725. 6 ff. there are three rhymes in one period, *elaborate . . . reuocate . . . consentiant . . . faciant . . . tenorem . . . uigorem*, each ending its clause; and the same number in 706. 13; in 731. 19 there are alternating rhymes, *proscripti sunt . . . fuerunt . . . profecti sunt . . . sumpserunt.*

A word at or near the beginning of a sentence rhyming with another at the end is also frequent; 262. 26 *post indumentum Christi perditum nullum iam uelle uestimentum*, 405. 18 *sudatur enim quamdiu istic uiuitur et laboratur*, 681. 1 *conpelluntur . . . prosecuntur*, 357. 19, 547. 7, 576. 19, 683. 2, &c.

That the number of rhymes of these different kinds is no accident may be seen from the cases in which Cyprian has forced his language into rhyme; 598. 2 *aduentantibus et rei ueritatem reportantibus*, where *aduentare*, a verb most rarely used by Cyprian, is manifestly less appropriate than *aduenire*; 629. 22 *factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de Dei . . . iudicio, de clericorum . . . testimonio, de plebis . . . suffragio, de sacerdotum . . . collegio*, where the last word, which is quite inappropriate, is used for the natural *consensu* (672. 7 and elsewhere) because of its ending, as is *praesentia* for *adsensus* in the similar passage 523. 5; 602. 18 *et laboramus et laborare debemus ut unitatem . . . obtinere curemus* for *obtineamus*; 398. 25 *inde patientia incipit, inde claritas eius et dignitas caput sumit. origo et magnitudo patientiae Deo auctore procedit*, where *et magnitudo* seems inserted because *claritas* in the preceding clause is provided with a rhyme; 731. 17 *Cyprianum . . . sacerdotem Dei agnoscentes et contestantes ei*, where *ei*, a word almost unused by Cyprian, and certainly never placed in an emphatic position elsewhere, is obviously set at the end of the period for rhyme with *Dei*; 394. 28 *in pace uincentibus coronam candidam pro operibus dabit*,

in persecutione purpuream pro passione geminabit[1], where nothing but the rhyme could have induced him to reject the natural *addet*; 231. 11 *quicquid a matrice discesserit seorsum uiuere et spirare non poterit, substantiam salutis amittit*, where only the rhyme can account for the change of tense; even stronger is 727. 21 *qui iudicio ac testimonio Dei non probantur tantum sed etiam gloriantur.* The sense required is that they receive not mere approval but actual praise. It would be against Cyprian's rules of rhythm to end a period with the hexametrical *glorificantur*; he therefore spoils his sense with *gloriantur*, unless indeed we suppose a verb *gloriare*=*glorificare*, very rare elsewhere[2]; so also 675. 5 *item Paulus monet nos cum mali de ecclesia pereunt non moueri nec recedentibus perfidis fidem minui*, where the violent change of construction can have no other purpose than rhyme; cf. *erunt . . . accipiunt* 252. 14.

Certain imperfect rhymes, which Cyprian appears to have intended for such, may here be mentioned; 302. 28 *cladem, laudem*, 370. 25 *laetus, gratus*, 393. 28 *unus est, communis est*, 471. 10 *locutus est, tuitus est*, 250. 21 *concessum, promissum*, 582. 18 *contabuit, pauit*; cf. *gemino sumus dolore percussi et duplici maerore confusi* in the Roman *Ep.* 36 (572. 12).

It remains to mention that Cyprian carefully avoids parechesis, except in such cases as *bonorum morum*, where it cannot be avoided. There are a few exceptions, as 593. 23 *adulterinis doctrinis*, but very few. One reason for Cyprian's use of *deifica disciplina* may be that *diuina disciplina* breaks this rule; see ch. ii. § 1.

The numerous instances of parallel clauses ending with *est*, *sunt*, &c. are no doubt arranged for purposes of rhyme, e.g. 189. 11 *nunc nobis ad uirgines sermo est, quarum quo sublimior gloria est maior et cura est*, 383. 15 *pecuniae tuae captiuus et seruus es, catenis cupiditatis et uinculis alligatus es, et quem soluerat Christus denuo uinctus es*, 642. 6 *quisquis ille est et qualiscumque*

[1] The difference in quantity does not deter Cyprian from this rhyme; *dabit . . . inrogabit* occurs 368. 11. *Robore et uigore* is a favourite expression.

[2] Yet cf. *gloriantes*=δοξάζοντες in *Ecclus.* 43. 30.

est, christianus non est qui in Christi ecclesia non est. The number of such terminations is striking; cf. 9. 3 *ut quis possit occidere peritia est, usus est, ars est,* 630. 7 *profanus est, alienus est, foris est.*

§ 15. Alliteration is at least as common as rhyme. The constant use of prepositional prefixes, evidently as much for this purpose as for amplification, is one of the most obvious features of Cyprian's style; e.g. 673. 12 *adplicito et adiuncto,* 802. 8 *addidit et adiecit,* 357. 17 *coartata et conclusa,* 711. 6 *conflueret et conueniret,* 217. 14 *designat et denuntiat,* 353. 5 *decrescit ac deficit,* 639. 5 *disponit et dirigit,* 675. 20 *enitimur et elaboramus,* 768. 22 *exorbitans et ... exerrans,* 357. 14 *increpat et incusat,* 233. 7 *inpeditos et inplicitos,* 351. 2 *oblatrantem et ... obstrepentem,* 632. 18 *offocari ... et opprimi,* 330. 17 *perseuerandi et permanendi,* 334. 15 *praemonet et praenuntiat,* 772. 9 *praeponere et praeferre,* 213. 9 *renititur et resistit,* 770. 16 *repudiare et reicere,* 687. 4 *suggerit et subministrat. Perdere* and *perire* are often combined, 410. 26, 421. 8, &c. Instances in which the alliterative verbs are in parallel clauses, or one of them a participle or replaced by a verbal noun, are also numerous, e.g. 355. 26 *corrumpat ... consumat,* 368. 6 *adueniens hoc admonet,* 584. 12 *congressioni et paci congruentes*; cf. 356. 6 *ecce uerbera desuper et flagella non desunt.* In these cases the alliterative words are rarely synonyms, but such juxtaposition is far too common to be an accident.

Ordinary alliteration is also very common, especially in the more rhetorical parts of Cyprian's writings; 4. 3 *uoluptaria uisio,* 7. 14 *uenenorum uirus,* 231. 6 *ueri itineris uia* (*uia ueritatis,* &c., 211. 4, 431. 11, 768. 23, 833. 5, and elsewhere), 217. 23 *oris osculum,* 195. 1 *gratia gloriae,* 238. 6 *capita captiua,* 430. 5 *suboles subseciua*; so also with words connected by conjunctions; 221. 1 *mandauit et monuit,* 373. 2 *multa et magna,* 404. 15 *magna et mira,* 674. 9 *magnalia et mirabilia,* 218. 16 *permittit et patitur,* 393. 13 and 699. 30 *libenter ac largiter,* 229. 25 *firmitas et fides,* 278. 2 *fortiter ac fidenter,* 731. 10 *propria et priuata,* 479. 6 *sollertia et sollicitudo,* 485. 8

credere et crescere, and many more. There are many alliterations also in words balancing one another in the same or different clauses; 3. 12 *dant secessum uicina secreta*, 368. 16 *uiuacibus flammis uorax poena*, 194. 28 *quibus multa magnalia cum miraculo faceret*, 238. 12 *quae cum saeculo sexum quoque uicerunt*, 423. 16 *non hominis sed honoris inimicus*, 577. 22 *hospitium carceris horreum conputatis*, 398. 19 *non uestitu sapientiam sed ueritate praeferimus*[1]; cf. *frugibus* . . . *fraglantia* 352. 28, *uindicta* . . . *uenia* 408. 23. In some cases it is plain that Cyprian has used forced language for purposes of alliteration, as in 582. 7 *nec fas fuerat nec decebat*, where the natural *erat* would not have given the effect, and in 676. 11 *qui non tantum ab his istic abstentus sed et abs te illic* . . . *pulsus est*[2]. So also 279. 7 *cottidianis immo continuis orationibus*, 374. 5 *sanguine et sanctificatione Christi*. *Cui uita iam deerat uictus abundantiam cogitabat* 282. 7 is an exact parallel to Apuleius, *Flor.* 16. 68 *dolor intestinorum* . . . *conpelleret ante letum abire quam lectum*; yet *uita uictusque* is Ciceronian.

Prolonged alliteration is very common, e.g. 8. 23 *paratur gladiatorius ludus, ut libidinem crudelium luminum sanguis oblectet*, 202. 25 *magna uos merces habet, praemium grande uirtutis, munus maximum castitatis*, 227. 20, 341. 12, 383. 23, 388. 11, 468. 18, &c. Often the alliteration is wholly or in part prepositional; 219. 16 *hos eosdem denuo Dominus denotat et designat dicens me dereliquerunt* sq., 363. 19 *quae de Dei indignatione descendunt*, 497. 12 *in petendo autem fuisse dissonas uoces et dispares uoluntates et uehementer hoc displicuisse illi qui dixerat, petite et inpetratis, quod plebis inaequalitas discreparet* sq., where besides the *dis* alliteration there is another with *u*, 230. 8 ff., &c. In 475. 4 f. a fivefold alliteration with *con*-

[1] This is borrowed from Min. Fel. 38. 6 (54. 20 Halm) *nos qui non habitu sapientiam sed mente praeferimus*, and is evidence, as far as it goes, of the precedence of Minucius. No one, in the third or fourth century, would have altered the alliterative *non uestitu sed ueritate* into the simple equivalent.

[2] The only other instance of *abs* in Cyprian is, I think, 253. 24 *abs te*. For language forced for alliteration cf. 561. 2 (Roman) *si nondum nostrum sanguinem fudimus sed fudisse parati sumus*. The aorist infinitive is simply alliterative.

occurs, ending with the very inappropriate verb *confitetur*; cf. 599. 8, where *confitentur* is chosen because of the preceding *consuluisse*.

Other alliterations are elaborately chiastic; 214. 13 *profluentes largiter riuos latius pandit*, and 732. 8 *Puppianus solus integer inuiolatus sanctus pudicus*, with their arrangements of p. l. r. l. p. and p. s. in. in. s. p., are perfectly symmetrical. Or the alliterative words may begin and end clauses, as 243. 13 *nec . . . ad profana contagia sponte properauimus; perdidit nos aliena perfidia; parentes sensimus parricidas*, where an alliteration begins and ends three successive clauses. But such examples are naturally more frequent with kindred words.

§ 16. Parataxis is exceedingly common in Cyprian, and is indeed more characteristic of him than any other rhetorical figure. The simplest form, as 13. 17 *saltibus saltus*, 421. 2 *frater fratris*, 251. 4, 340. 27, 422. 8, &c. is comparatively rare; cf. 254. 21 *ab inmundo spiritu inmunda correpta*, 658. 1 *iusto iustorum praecedentium exemplo*, 357. 19 *indignamini indignari Deum*, &c. Cognate words in close connexion are more common; 199. 22 *quando oculi tibi non sunt quos Deus fecit sed quos diabolus infecit*, 689. 2 *iacens et abiectus*, 690. 11 *nec capi nec decipi*, 657. 14 *uiuit et uiuificat*, 785. 22 (with alliteration) *Paradisi potus salubres et salutares*, 710. 12 *a sapore saeculari resipiscere*, 769. 7 *ut intus per sanctos sanctificetur*, 11. 8, 200. 24, &c. So also when the words are in different, and especially in antithetical, clauses; 362. 23 *cum statu oris et corporis animum tuum statue*, 694. 3 *magis durus saecularis philosophiae prauitate quam sophiae dominicae lenitate pacificus*, where the verbal opportunity has caused Cyprian to overcome his dislike of Greek words, 496. 5 *sibi placentes et omnibus displicentes*, 662. 20 *uenit Antichristus sed superuenit Christus*, 259. 17 *auro te licet . . . condecores sine Christi decore deformis es*, 356. 23 *et non agnoscis Dominum Deum tuum cum sic exerceas ipse dominatum?*, 581. 2 *illic fuisse conspicuum gentilium multitudini, hic a fratribus conspici* (so also 357. 26), 428. 18, a double example, *si accepto Spiritu sancto sancte et*

spiritaliter uiuimus, cf. 471. 12. Another chiastic instance is 420. 17 *tam paratus semper ad repugnandum quam est ad inpugnandum paratus inimicus*. But Cyprian's favourite instances are *fides* and *sacerdos* with their cognates contrasted with *perfidia*, *sacrilegium*, &c.; 229. 19 *si . . . fidem primam perfidia posteriore mutauerit*, 769. 12 *dum sacerdotem quaerit in sacrilegum fraude erroris incurrit*, 723. 15 *qui idolis sacrificando sacrilega sacrificia fecerunt sacerdotium Dei sibi uindicare non possunt*, 382. 23, 675. 5, 777. 20, 253. 22, 471. 6, 687. 21, 737. 22, &c.; cf. 226. 5, 431. 1.

But the chief use of this figure in Cyprian is for continuance of thought, not for antithesis. Such language as 277. 20 *qui in aeternum manere uolumus Dei qui aeternus est uoluntatem facere debemus*, 233. 11 *ut . . . euigilet fides nostra uigilantiae praemium de Domino receptura*, cf. the whole passage, 646. 18 *operari tu putas rusticum posse si dixeris 'agrum peritia omni rusticitatis exerce'* sq., where a very rare word has been chosen to keep up the connexion of language, 307. 29, 427. 19, 492. 2, &c. is common. Prolonged parataxis, often combined with anaphora or alliteration, is a marked characteristic of Cyprian's style; 500. 9 *ad . . . dignatione eius indignum . . . mandare dignatus est*, 468. 18 *ceterum quantum uult inde quaerat, qualis quaestus est* sq., 313. 18 *patriam nos nostram paradisum conputamus, parentes patriarchas habere iam coepimus; quid non properamus et currimus ut patriam nostram uidere et parentes salutare possimus*, 470. 14 *qui . . . per omnes contumelias et poenas superbum populum calcaret et premeret ut contemptus sacerdos de superbo populo ultione diuina uindicaretur*. In the third of these examples the chiastic *patr. par. par. patr.* is to be noticed; in the fourth the recurrence of *c. et p.* in the first, and the repeated words in the middle of both clauses. A more complicated example is 310. 22 *quod interim morimur, ad inmortalitatem morte transgredimur, nec potest uita aeterna succedere nisi hinc contigerit exire. non est exitus iste sed transitus et temporali itinere decurso ad aeterna transgressus*. Here, beside the repetition of *aeterna*,

three verbs with their cognates and two prefixes are pressed into the service. Another elaborate instance is 409. 16 ff. *nam cum in illa prima transgressione praecepti firmitas corporis cum inmortalitate discesserit et cum morte infirmitas uenerit, nec possit firmitas recipi nisi cum recepta et inmortalitas fuerit, oportet in hac fragilitate adque infirmitate corporea luctari semper et congredi, quae luctatio et congressio* sq. The stiff monotony of these two passages is not due to carelessness; they are from the most rhetorical of Cyprian's later writings, the *De Bono Patientiae*, and the words were no doubt deliberately chosen and arranged. Similar passages are excessively numerous throughout Cyprian's writings; among the best are those which begin 261. 17, 361. 9, 393. 9, 501. 5, 647. 4, 693. 4. In some instances the language is forced for the sake of symmetry; e.g. 381. 18, where at the end of a long parataxis we read *et dum times ne pro te patrimonium perdas, ipse pro patrimonio pereas*, 493. 16 *hunc igitur agonem per prophetas ante praedictum, per Dominum commissum, per apostolos gestum* sq.; 576. 9 *per tales talia perferuntur.* In all these and in many more cases prepositions are used unnaturally for this rhetorical purpose. No stronger instance of Cyprian's attachment to this figure can be found than his consenting to use the unliterary word *deificus* (see ch. ii. § 1) in parataxis with *Deus*; 618. 22 *nec remanere in ecclesia Dei possunt qui deificam et ecclesiasticam disciplinam* sq., and elsewhere. He avoids it in every other context. It remains to mention such prolonged instances as 582. 19 *iacuit inter poenas poenis suis fortior, inclusus includentibus maior, iacens stantibus celsior, uincientibus firmior uinctus, sublimior iudicantibus iudicatus*, and 695. 18 *ut pascendo gregi pastor et gubernandae naui gubernator et plebi regendae rector redderetur* sq. These also are not uncommon in Cyprian.

§ 17. No figure is more common than anaphora in Cyprian; it is constantly used both in prolonging a period and in beginning successive sentences; 319. 5 *insinuantes et docentes hoc esse baptisma in gratia maius, in potestate sublimius, in honore pretiosius, baptisma in quo angeli baptizant, baptisma in*

quo Deus et Christus eius exultant, baptisma post quod nemo iam peccat, baptisma quod fidei nostrae incrementa consummat, baptisma quod nos de mundo recedentes statim Deo copulat. in aquae baptismo sq. Not only is *baptisma* carried through the sentence, but Cyprian also, for the sake of symmetry, here uses the vulgar *in* instrumental—*baptisma in quo angeli baptizant*—which is very rare in his writings. This may be compared with his use of *deificus*, mentioned above. Other good instances are 368. 9 ff. *credite illi qui omnino non fallit. credite illi qui haec omnia futura praedixit. credite illi qui credentibus praemium uitae aeternae dabit. credite illi qui incredulis aeterna supplicia gehennae ardoribus inrogabit*, and 731. 6 ff. *dixisti sane scrupulum tibi esse tollendum de animo, in quem incidisti. incidisti, sed tua credulitate inreligiosa. incidisti, sed tua mente et uoluntate sacrilega, dum incesta, dum inpia, dum nefanda contra fratrem, contra sacerdotem facile audis libenter et credis.* In *De Hab. Virg.* §§ 8–11 begin with *locupletem te dicis et diuitem*; in *Mort.* 14 (306. 2 ff.) five short sentences begin with *mori timeat*; in *Ep.* 74. § 8 (805. 16 ff.) are five questions beginning *dat honorem Deo qui*, followed by *si sic honor Deo datur*; in *Ep.* 55. 20 (638. 16 ff.) an eightfold example. Other instances, more or less elaborate and regular, are countless; 359. 18, 672. 5, 595. 9, 829. 18, &c.[1]. In some cases the aim is obviously alliteration, as in 202. 7 *uince uestem quae uirgo es, uince aurum.*

The examples of the same word repeated at the beginning and end of a clause are few; 479. 20 *salutat uos diaconus et qui mecum sunt salutant*, 596. 7 *pacem pollicetur ne perueniri possit ad pacem. salutem promittit ne qui deliquit ueniat ad salutem*, and probably others; cf. 365. 12 *Dei hominem et cultorem Dei*, 414. 19, &c. This is more common with cognate words, as 686. 18 *delictis plus quam quod oportet remittendis paene ipse delinquo*, and with rhyming words[2].

[1] Cf. Seneca, *N. Q.* 3 *prolog. quid est praecipuum?* six times repeated.

[2] For this figure cf. Volkmann's *Rhetorik der Gr. u. Römer* 471, and Apuleius, *Met.* 4. 32, 11. 5 (76. 13, 208. 7 Eyss.), though neither is an exact parallel.

§ 18. Asyndeton, not to any noteworthy extent of words, but of clauses, is very characteristic of the style of Cyprian. Especially it is his custom to end long periods with a string of asyndeta; e.g. 5. 18 *tenacibus semper inlecebris necesse est, ut solebat, uinolentia inuitet, inflet superbia, iracundia inflammet, rapacitas inquietet, crudelitas stimulet, ambitio delectet, libido praecipitet.* In this instance Cyprian was no doubt as much interested in the rhyme as in the asyndeton; but he was so well satisfied with the latter that he has repeated the combination in no less than four other treatises, though less completely and with much variation: 225. 9, 299. 17, 423. 6; cf. 357. 27, which, however, is not asyndetic. Other good examples are 411. 26, 596. 4, 617. 18, 655. 18, 806. 1.

A period formed of two asyndetic clauses of some length, often antithetical, is common, as also an unconnected clause at the end of a period; cf. 412. 7 *docet delinquentibus cito ignoscere, si ipse delinquas diu et multum rogare,* 231. 10, 425. 19, 746. 7, 765. 11, 793. 10. Long asyndetic passages, with anaphora and alliteration, are frequent; *Mort.* § 26 and *Z. L.* §§ 7, 8 are good examples.

Though Cyprian's use of copulative conjunctions is variable and eccentric[1], he does not seem to have used polysyndeton as a rhetorical figure.

§ 19. Amplification by means of synonymous nouns co-ordinated is common in Cyprian. The simplest form, of two substantives without epithet, is not the most usual. *Preces et orationes*, words without any distinction of meaning in this writer, occurs at least eight times (see p. 269 for this and other pleonasms concerning prayer); *scopulos et saxa* 474. 5[2], *conflictationes et pressurae* 404. 29, *apostatae et desertores uel aduersarii et hostes* 647. 16, *uictimae et hostiae* 195. 21, 652. 24,

[1] Cf. the passages beginning 412. 17, 527. 22, 587. 14, 668. 2.

[2] This is a favourite pleonasm of Seneca, *Ben.* 4. 22. 3, *Dial.* 2. 1. 2 *saxa et rupes*, *N. Q.* 2. 6. 5 *scopulos rupesque*, *N. Q.* 3. 12. 2 *saxa cautesque*, *N. Q.* 4. 2. 5 *scopuli cautium.* Apuleius, *Met.* 5. 27 (94. 26 Eyss.) *saxa cautium*, *Met.* 6. 31 (116. 27) *saxum scruposum.* Lucan, 2. 619 *scopulosae rupis*, 5. 675 *scruposis saxis*, Ambr. *Ep.* 6. 13 *scrupea rupes.* Cyprian has *scopulosa saxa* 301. 23.

mora et tarditas 497. 4; cf. 240. 5, 694. 22, and many more. *Aduersarius et Inimicus*, *episcopi et sacerdotes*, and others, which are practically fixed theological terms, will be found in the next chapter. It may be noted that in 383. 9 ff. there are to be found within eight lines *ineptis et stultis*, *metu et sollicitudine*, *secreta et abdita*, *alta et profunda*, *captiuus et seruus*, *catenis et uinculis*; cf. also 309. 24 ff.

It is not very often that one of these coordinated substantives defines the other, as in 310. 18 *uerbis et promissis*, 525. 11 *obsequiis et operibus*, 597. 12 *ex eorum sermone adque adseueratione*, 600. 2 *sinum adque conplexum*; cf. the context. A singular abstract with a plural concrete is more usual; *ui et lapidibus* 408. 22, *in latebris adque in solitudine*, . . . *in febribus et in languore* 654. 2 f.; so 659. 23, 666. 1, 679. 4, 688. 11, &c.

Adjectives are often similarly joined; 363. 18 *clarum adque manifestum*, 257. 12 *abdita et secreta*, 618. 14 *similia et paria*, 268. 26, 780. 9, &c. This is more usual than two identical adjectives attached to a substantive; *parua et modica delicta* 682. 3, and again 786. 21, *sub regali ac tyrannica seruitute* 337. 21, *eiusmodi et tales serui* 567. 21; cf. Novatian in *Ep.* 30 (555. 23) *episcopi uicini et adpropinquantes.*

It is more usual for Cyprian to double both epithet and substantive; *fama mendax et falsus rumor* 601. 7, *dissimulatio nulla, nulla cunctatio* 358. 23; for this use of *dissimulatio* see p. 301, *pares ambo et uterque consimiles* 584. 8, *proxima mors et uicina arcessitio* 298. 25, *mandata diuina ac praecepta caelestia* 338. 12, 378. 21, and often; cf. 356. 18, 419. 11, 422. 25, 580. 20, 798. 14, &c.

Double adverbs are also common; 290. 8 *sollicite et caute*, 649. 12 *incaute et temere*, 309. 24 *merito ac iure*, 648. 1 *uberius ac plenius*, &c.; cf. 675. 12 *ultro et crimine suo perire.* But as a rule they are employed for alliteration rather than simply to fill out the sentence.

When synonymous and even not synonymous nouns are preceded by a preposition, this preposition is often repeated for the sake of symmetry; 505. 23 *in arto et in angusto*

itinere, 593. 4 *a uultibus adque ab oculis uestris*, ib. 11 *per minas et per insidias perfidorum*, 731. 20 *in carcere et in catenis*. In the two last alliteration is partly the motive. Other instances of such repeated prepositions are 404. 12, 421. 4, 606. 10, 641. 22, 654. 2, 3, 6.

When synonymous verbs and participles are coordinated, it is more usually with a view to alliteration than to simple amplification. For such forms as *addimus et adiungimus*, *recreati et renati*, &c. see § 15. Cyprian's otiose manner of citing Scripture is mentioned in the next chapter, § 6. In addition to the examples cited there, good instances will be found in *Ep.* 74. §§ 3, 11 and *Laps.* 15. Beside such cases there are many others, e.g. *uereris et metuis* 380. 8, *festinat et properat* 414. 27, *adgnoscant adque intellegant* 599. 4, *quam* (sc. *persecutionem*) *iste uoto quodam euadendae et lucrandae*[1] *damnationis excipiens haec omnia commisit et miscuit, ut qui eici de ecclesia et excludi habebat* sq. 619. 12, *Goliath interfecto et ope ac dignatione diuina tanto hoste deleto* 422. 12.

There are some instances of double synonymous phrases; 196. 12 *fugiant castae uirgines et pudicae incestarum cultus, habitus inpudicarum, lupanarum*[2] *insignia, ornamenta meretricum*; cf. 363. 11 *ruinis rerum, iacturis opum, dispendio militum, deminutione castrorum*[3].

Though Cyprian's usual amplification may be expressed by the formula AB + AB, in some cases he varies it by doubling the qualifying synonym in the second half, thus using the form AB + AAB; e.g. 388. 21 *bis delinquis et geminum ac duplex crimen admittis*, 601. 1 *neque enim facile promenda sunt et incaute ac temere publicanda quae* sq.[4]; cf. 365. 18 *exul-*

[1] For *lucrari* = *effugere* see p. 308.

[2] Cf. 699. 25 *lenonum et lupanarum insignia*; see Haussleiter in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 8. 145, Wölfflin, ib. p. 8, on *Spect.* 5 (App. 8. 5), and Georges' *Lexicon*, *s.v.* In all these cases *lupana* = *meretrix*.

[3] I. e. *exercituum*, as in 693. 11 and elsewhere in Cyprian.

[4] There are other instances to which the references are unfortunately lost; quite sufficient in all to prove that this form is no accident, but a deliberate rhetorical device. I have not noticed it in Apuleius.

tant semper in Domino et laetantur et gaudent in Deo suo, 669. 9, &c.

Clauses identical in meaning are not uncommon; e.g. 249. 17 *nemo se fallat, nemo decipiat,* 195. 7 *diuitem te sentiant pauperes, locupletem te sentiant indigentes,* 581. 7 *quoniam semper gaudium properat nec potest moras ferre laetitia,* 426. 2 ff., a triple instance, 247. 2, 363. 12, &c. So Novatian in *Ep.* 30 (553. 20) *non sit minor medicina quam uulnus est, non sint minora remedia quam funera*[1], and probably the same writer in *Ep.* 36 (572. 12).

It was naturally more difficult to find three synonyms than to find two, and therefore cases are less common in Cyprian, though by no means rare; e.g. 198. 7 *opus Dei et factura eius et plastica,* 305. 6 *infirmitas et inbecillitas et uastitas,* 284. 22 *pacificos et concordes adque unanimes,* 400. 11 *quisque lenis patiens et mitis est,* 720. 15 *adultos et prouectos et maiores natu,* 310. 1 *si simulata, si ficta, si fucata uidentur esse quae dicimus,* ib. 4 *inprobat denique apostolus Paulus et obiurgat et culpat,* 377. 16 *reuelat angelus et manifestat et firmat,* 618. 3 *hostis quietis, tranquillitatis aduersarius, pacis inimicus,* 318. 3 *circumuenit nescium, fallit incautum, decipit inperitum*; this last is preceded by three *si* clauses.

The subordination of synonymous substantives is also very common; 217. 23, 220. 17 *concordia pacis,* 285. 11 *concordiae pax,* 222. 1 *zeli discordia,* 198. 20, 226. 11 *temeritatis audacia,* 284. 14 *uigor censurae,* 744. 16 *censura uigoris,* 301. 8 *morbi ualetudo,* 5. 10, 15. 26 *senium uetustatis,* 618. 23 *actus conuersatio,* 200. 13 *sermonum conloquia* (cf. *sermo conloquii* in *Ep.* 75, 826. 8), 721. 17 *lapsus ruinae,* 201. 10 *amictus uestis,* 7. 14, 806. 11 *uenenorum uirus,* 502. 17, 503. 20, 632. 19 *exitus mortis,* 490. 11 *certaminis proelium,* 202. 11, 214. 12, 228. 19, 231. 6, 318. 15, 500. 15, 617. 1, 775. 10, &c. So

[1] Novatian had certainly learned rhetoric in the same school with Cyprian and Apuleius. His attempts at effect in language are the same as theirs. His characteristic difference from both is the parade of logical method, in syllogism, &c. The three writers are of course widely different in vocabulary.

with gerunds; 194. 11 *concupiscendi libido*, 602. 14 *ambigendi scrupulus*, 479. 11 *introeundi aditus*. Instances where the dependent substantive is of narrower application than the other are frequent, e.g. *hospitium carceris* 494. 2, 577. 22, *carcerum claustra* 828. 8, *custodia carceris* 582. 15, *obsequium operationis* 503. 18 (cf. 525. 11), *subsidium cibi* 283. 10, *quantitas numeri* 338. 7, *uoluntatis imperium* 308. 16, *conuiciorum probra, contumeliarum ludibria* 402. 9, 10. Two synonymous nouns combined with a synonymous genitive occur 373. 18 *fragilitatis humanae infirmitas atque inbecillitas*.

A synonymous substantive and adjective also stand often together; 15. 5 *inmortalitas aeterna*, 301. 23 *scopulosa saxa*, 355. 26 *morbida ualetudo*, 421. 11 *maliuolus liuor*, 422. 11 *mitis lenitas*, 578. 13 *multiplex numerositas*, 583. 14 *generosa nobilitas*, 644. 11 *caenosa uorago* (cf. in *Ep.* 75 *uorago et caenum* 824. 21), 702. 1 *ultronea uoluntate* = *ultro*, 783. 6 *adumbrata simulatio*, 364. 20 *aeuum temporale*, 35. 10, 224. 2 *conpendium breuians*, 7. 17 *increpantes minae*, 287. 6 *collecta breuitas*; cf. 272. 8[1]. I have only noticed one instance of a double synonymous adjective with a synonymous substantive, 313. 4 *turbida et procellosa tempestas* (cf. 501. 21, 618. 2).

Examples of a synonym or synonyms under a government different from that of the adjective are also frequent, e.g. 189. 21 *cauti ad sollicitudinem*, 214. 6 *exundantis copiae largitas*, 230. 20 *aliqua fallentis astutiae calliditate decepti*, 250. 3 *praepropera festinatione temerarius* (and similarly 528. 9), 424. 25 *remedium curae medentis*, 578. 11 *inmota et inconcussa fide stabiles*, 624. 22 *aestuantis animi sollicitudo suspensa*, 689. 3 *inbecillitate humanae mediocritatis inualidus*, 617. 20 *auaritiae inexplebilis rapacitate furibundus*, *adrogantia et stupore superbi tumoris inflatus*, 192. 12, 357. 28, 422. 11, 478. 12, 807. 17, &c.

Otiose pronouns are not uncommon. It is, of course, possible that many of these are not inserted for purposes of rhetoric, but simply through carelessness. Yet the large number of similar cases in Apuleius and Arnobius makes it

[1] Similarly in 501. 17 *exiguam stantium paucitatem* should probably be read.

certain that this was a rhetorical device in Cyprian also. A curious coordination occurs twice; 668. 14 *conuicia eorum quibus se et uitam suam cottidie lacerant*, 718. 13 *nobis enim adque oculis nostris . . . accipere qui nati sunt incrementum uidentur*; cf. in the Roman *Ep.* 36 (572. 16) *nos adque animum nostrum.* The apposition *nos, ego et Liberalis* occurs 606. 9. The repetition of antecedent after relative is rare; 498. 10 *iuuene qui iuuenis*, 752. 21 *agni qui agnus*, and 720. 5; cf. 773. 1 *ut quia ouis iam fuerat hanc ouem . . . pastor recipiat.*

But most of the examples in Cyprian are of the repetition of a personal or demonstrative pronoun under the same or a different construction, in either case without helping the sense[1]. So 607. 7 *nos enim singulis nauigantibus . . . nos scimus hortatos esse ut* sq., 623. 6 *ut se putet . . . palam iam ferre se posse* (the true reading), 587. 17 *ut etiam nunc ego . . . omnes opto me nosse*='I wish to know all;' cf. 276. 20 *et ideo Christiani qui in oratione appellare patrem Deum coepimus nos et ut regnum Dei nobis ueniat oramus.* A superfluous demonstrative pronoun appears after a substantive or a relative, e.g. 593. 23 (*presbyteri*) *qui ad duorum presbyterorum ueterem nequitiam respondentes, sicut illi Susannam pudicam corrumpere et uiolare conati sunt, sic et hi adulterinis doctrinis ecclesiae pudicitiam corrumpere . . . conantur*, 615. 10 *in confessoribus . . . nemo non socium se et participem eorum gloriae conputat*, 784. 16 *quod autem quidam dicunt eis qui in Samaria baptizati fuerant . . . tantum super eos manum inpositam esse*; cf. ib. 24, 606. 12, 638. 6, &c. Possessives are often used needlessly; 7. 4 *si iustitiae uiam teneas inlapsa firmitate uestigii tui*, 340. 19 *mater . . . tam grande martyrium Deo praebens uirtute oculorum suorum quam praebuerant filii eius tormentis et passione membrorum*; for *suus* a large collection, which can be at least doubled, is given by Hartel *s. v.* The superfluous *eius* has a similar use; to Hartel's list *s. v. is* may be added, 423. 18,

[1] Cf. Apul. *Met.* 5. 25 (93. 20 Eyss.) *nec te rursus praecipitio uel ullo mortis accersito te genere perimas*; Gell. 2. 3. 1 *H litteram . . . inserebant eam ueteres* sq.; Arnobius 7. 30 (264. 17 Reiff.), &c., with Hildebrand's note, p. 499.

with gerunds; 194. 11 *concupiscendi libido*, 602. 14 *ambigendi scrupulus*, 479. 11 *introeundi aditus*. Instances where the dependent substantive is of narrower application than the other are frequent, e.g. *hospitium carceris* 494. 2, 577. 22, *carcerum claustra* 828. 8, *custodia carceris* 582. 15, *obsequium operationis* 503. 18 (cf. 525. 11), *subsidium cibi* 283. 10, *quantitas numeri* 338. 7, *uoluntatis imperium* 308. 16, *conuiciorum probra, contumeliarum ludibria* 402. 9, 10. Two synonymous nouns combined with a synonymous genitive occur 373. 18 *fragilitatis humanae infirmitas atque inbecillitas*.

A synonymous substantive and adjective also stand often together; 15. 5 *inmortalitas aeterna*, 301. 23 *scopulosa saxa*, 355. 26 *morbida ualetudo*, 421. 11 *maliuolus liuor*, 422. 11 *mitis lenitas*, 578. 13 *multiplex numerositas*, 583. 14 *generosa nobilitas*, 644. 11 *caenosa uorago* (cf. in *Ep.* 75 *uorago et caenum* 824. 21), 702. 1 *ultronea uoluntate = ultro*, 783. 6 *adumbrata simulatio*, 364. 20 *aeuum temporale*, 35. 10, 224. 2 *conpendium breuians*, 7. 17 *increpantes minae*, 287. 6 *collecta breuitas*; cf. 272. 8[1]. I have only noticed one instance of a double synonymous adjective with a synonymous substantive, 313. 4 *turbida et procellosa tempestas* (cf. 501. 21, 618. 2).

Examples of a synonym or synonyms under a government different from that of the adjective are also frequent, e.g. 189. 21 *cauti ad sollicitudinem*, 214. 6 *exundantis copiae largitas*, 230. 20 *aliqua fallentis astutiae calliditate decepti*, 250. 3 *praepropera festinatione temerarius* (and similarly 528. 9), 424. 25 *remedium curae medentis*, 578. 11 *inmota et inconcussa fide stabiles*, 624. 22 *aestuantis animi sollicitudo suspensa*, 689. 3 *inbecillitate humanae mediocritatis inualidus*, 617. 20 *auaritiae inexplebilis rapacitate furibundus*, *adrogantia et stupore superbi tumoris inflatus*, 192. 12, 357. 28, 422. 11, 478. 12, 807. 17, &c.

Otiose pronouns are not uncommon. It is, of course, possible that many of these are not inserted for purposes of rhetoric, but simply through carelessness. Yet the large number of similar cases in Apuleius and Arnobius makes it

[1] Similarly in 501. 17 *exiguam stantium paucitatem* should probably be read.

certain that this was a rhetorical device in Cyprian also. A curious coordination occurs twice; 668. 14 *conuicia eorum quibus se et uitam suam cottidie lacerant*, 718. 13 *nobis enim adque oculis nostris . . . accipere qui nati sunt incrementum uidentur*; cf. in the Roman *Ep.* 36 (572. 16) *nos adque animum nostrum.* The apposition *nos, ego et Liberalis* occurs 606. 9. The repetition of antecedent after relative is rare; 498. 10 *iuuene qui iuuenis*, 752. 21 *agni qui agnus*, and 720. 5; cf. 773. 1 *ut quia ouis iam fuerat hanc ouem . . . pastor recipiat.*

But most of the examples in Cyprian are of the repetition of a personal or demonstrative pronoun under the same or a different construction, in either case without helping the sense[1]. So 607. 7 *nos enim singulis nauigantibus . . . nos scimus hortatos esse ut* sq., 623. 6 *ut se putet . . . palam iam ferre se posse* (the true reading), 587. 17 *ut etiam nunc ego . . . omnes opto me nosse*='I wish to know all;' cf. 276. 20 *et ideo Christiani qui in oratione appellare patrem Deum coepimus nos et ut regnum Dei nobis ueniat oramus.* A superfluous demonstrative pronoun appears after a substantive or a relative, e.g. 593. 23 (*presbyteri*) *qui ad duorum presbyterorum ueterem nequitiam respondentes, sicut illi Susannam pudicam corrumpere et uiolare conati sunt, sic et hi adulterinis doctrinis ecclesiae pudicitiam corrumpere . . . conantur*, 615. 10 *in confessoribus . . . nemo non socium se et participem eorum gloriae conputat*, 784. 16 *quod autem quidam dicunt eis qui in Samaria baptizati fuerant . . . tantum super eos manum inpositam esse*; cf. ib. 24, 606. 12, 638. 6, &c. Possessives are often used needlessly; 7. 4 *si iustitiae uiam teneas inlapsa firmitate uestigii tui*, 340. 19 *mater . . . tam grande martyrium Deo praebens uirtute oculorum suorum quam praebuerant filii eius tormentis et passione membrorum*; for *suus* a large collection, which can be at least doubled, is given by Hartel *s. v.* The superfluous *eius* has a similar use; to Hartel's list *s. v. is* may be added, 423. 18,

[1] Cf. Apul. *Met.* 5. 25 (93. 20 Eyss.) *nec te rursus praecipitio uel ullo mortis accersito te genere perimas*; Gell. 2. 3. 1 *H litteram . . . inserebant eam ueteres* sq.; Arnobius 7. 30 (264. 17 Reiff.), &c., with Hildebrand's note, p. 499.

503. 14, 595. 25, 670. 8, and many more. *Deus et Christus eius,* if the *eius* be superfluous, is mentioned in the next chapter, § 4.

Such uses as 582. 26 *et si aliquis Thomae similis extiterit qui minus auribus credat, nec oculorum fides deest ut quis quod audit et uideat*, and 547. 12 *ne quid conscientiam uestram lateret quid mihi scriptum sit, quidque ego rescripserim* are not uncommon; *quis* is a pronoun which Cyprian used often and sometimes strangely[1]: *quid deinde illud, quale est ut* or *quod* sq., *quid deinde illud, quam* sq., and similar phrases are used several times in rhetorical questions; 9. 6, 307. 3, 359. 16, 507. 20, 792. 12, and elsewhere.

Otiose pronouns in apposition are rare in Cyprian and not remarkable, e. g. *hic idem* 570. 4, 584. 20, *is ipse* 359. 16, 583. 23, and, as a substitute for *quisquis, talis . . . quisque* 225. 25; cf. *quod totum hoc* in *Ep.* 75 (811. 27)[2].

A verb synonymous with its subject or a participle with the noun in agreement, occurs several times; 213. 1, 4 *originem ab uno incipientem . . . exordium ab unitate proficiscitur*, 542. 12 *denique huius seditionis origo iam coepit*, 398. 25, &c.; synonymous with an adjective 490. 4 *exulto laetus et gratulor*[3], 488. 23 *cum opinio dubia nutaret*, 430. 17 *oratio iugis omnino non cesset*, &c.; with the adjective as object 360. 12 *multiplicas*

[1] But these may be merely careless language, as is that of Caldonius, 537. 13 *ne quid uidear temere aliquid praesumere.*

[2] To syntax rather than to style belongs the use of *plusquam quod* for *plusquam*, e.g. 687. 15 *aut plus existimemus ad inpugnandum posse humana conamina quam quod ad protegendum praeualet diuina tutela*, cf. 321. 10, 526. 14, 686. 19, and elsewhere; but in 623. 10 the *quod* is omitted. *Illud* or *hoc* introducing an *ut, quod* or acc. inf. clause is frequent, 305. 14, 547. 15, 713. 20, 756. 6, 765. 5, 799. 14. Through the weakening of *ut* as a final particle—its normal use in Cyprian is consecutive or explanatory—*ad hoc* or *propter hoc* are used, the former especially, to give the final sense to *ut* or *ne*. To Hartel's list of the former may be added 14. 8, 15. 8, 102. 23 and very many more; *propter hoc ut* 839. 12, *propter hoc . . . ne* 653. 9, *propter hoc quod* 756. 9. Similarly, to strengthen *quod, hoc ipso, ex hoc ipso*, &c. are often used, e.g. 321. 1, 406. 14, 720. 22, &c., cf. *hoc ipso si* 195. 15, *hoc ipso quo* 387. 14, 512. 4, *hoc ipso quia* 693. 4.

[3] *Gratulari = gaudere* is common in Cyprian; cf. 545. 6 *laetatus satis et plurimum gratulatus quod* sq.; see p. 308.

numerosa supplicia. A synonymous adverb and verb are also common: 569. 2 *pertinaciter persistere,* 707. 17 *rursus iterare,* 540. 3 *nec delicto priori adiciant adhuc aliud delictum* (cf. 249. 22, 254. 3, 792. 17), 5. 6 *denuo renasci,* 640. 10 *denuo redire,* 591. 11 *denuo renouare,* 391. 8 *ante praedicere,* which is very common. Indeed verbs formed with *prae* are usually preceded by *ante,* as *ante praeuenire* 347. 14, *ante praemittere* 720. 1, *ante praemonere* 768. 22, *ante praestruere* 209. 11, *ante praemonstrare* 704. 12. Both *denuo* and *ante* occur together in 706. 13 *denuo praecanitur et ante praedicitur,* unless, as is very probable, *item denuo* go together. Instances of a synonymous verb and noun connected by a preposition are not frequent; 15. 26 *non haec unquam procumbet in lapsum senio uetustatis,* 188. 22 *per omnia seruitutis obsequia Redemptoris imperio pareamus,* 431. 13 *ut diuina et spiritalis seges in copiam fecundae messis exuberet,* 785. 17 *arbores frugiferas intra muros suos intus inclusit,* 243. 17, 362. 20, &c. *Nisi cum Trofimo comitante uenissent,* 632. 3, may be classed with these, and 577. 8 *reuertentis anni uolubilem circulum.* A synonymous ablative is more common, usually in elaborate phrases containing other forms of amplification; 424. 5 *quantoque ille cui inuidetur successu meliore profecerit tanto inuidus in maius incendium liuoris ignibus inardescit,* 293. 20 *quando mundi lege decurrens uicibus alternis nox reuoluta succedit,* 643. 23 *quando . . . uasa lignea diuini ardoris incendio concrementur,* 670. 7 *cum tormentis cruciabundus flammae cremantis ardoribus aduratur,* 576. 16 *cum in secessu priuatis precibus oramus,* and similarly 275. 18, 501. 9, 567. 2, &c., 724. 7 *cenis adque epulis etiam nunc inhiant quarum crapulam super superstitem in dies cruditate ructabant,* and many more. Cf. the periphrastic *amor quo diligis* 4. 5, *cari quos diligimus* 300. 25.

Temporal and local adverbs are often combined, others rarely. *Diu multumque differtur* 400. 7, 412. 8, 623. 14, *festinato statim* 676. 3, *seorsum foris* 672. 9; cf. *primo et inter initia* 625. 13. *Iamiamque* seems only to occur once, 833. 7; *tandem iam* 726. 10. *Quando adhuc et,* strictly temporal, is

read, 477. 1[1]. An adverb with a synonymous prepositional expression is very common, though the adverbs so employed are few; *hic in ecclesia* 584. 17, *illic in carcere* 576. 10, *illic apud clericos* 479. 3, *illinc a uobis* 618. 4, *inde ad nos* 617. 18, *istic in mundo* 301. 14, *istic apud fratres* 678. 17, *istinc de saeculo* 310. 13, *intus in ecclesia* 647. 16, *foris extra ecclesiam* 214. 25, are instances of the usual types. *Statim* is often similarly used; *in primo statim natiuitatis exordio* 243. 11, *a primo statim persecutionis die* 679. 21, 210. 3, 272. 20, 337. 2, 401. 10, 405. 18, 482. 1, 721. 9, &c.; so also *adhuc* 354. 3, 797. 21. An adverb synonymous with an adjective occurs 272. 8 *breuiter collecta* (cf. *collecta breuitas* 287. 6), 808. 10 *quo minus aqua continua perseueranter ac iugiter flueret,* 519. 15 *quando ipsa ante mater nostra pacem . . . prior sumpserit*; cf. 421. 11 *non prius alterum deiciens . . . quam ipse zelo ante deiectus,* and 695. 6. Two very Apuleian expressions are 541. 3 *libellos gregatim multis dare* and 598. 21, cited above, p. 201. There remain the otiose uses of *magis*[2] and *adhuc*. *Magis ac magis* is used at least twelve times, 225. 8, &c., *magis* followed by a comparative thrice; 397. 10 *quid magis sit uel utilius ad uitam uel maius ad gloriam quam* sq.[3], 420. 19, 583. 17. *Magis* is followed by an otiose *plus* 513. 12. *Adhuc* is used like *magis* to strengthen a comparative; to Hartel's instances add 356. 9, 357. 21, 694. 1; *adhuc magis* together 404. 8, *ultra adhuc* 287. 12 and 667. 2, *adhuc insuper*[4] 359.

[1] *Et tunc quidem gladio occidebantur, quando adhuc et circumcisio carnalis manebat.* Hartel's statement, *s. v. quando*, that the word is used *perraro* with the indicative is an overstatement. The instances, both temporal and logical, are fairly numerous.

[2] This adverb, which gives Cyprian great difficulty, has many irregular uses, not given in Hartel's *Index*, which belong rather to syntax than to style. *Magis tam*, of which he gives two instances, also occurs 549. 17, but is confined to the Roman letters.

[3] This is not carelessness, but no doubt a superfluous word introduced for parallelism with the *maius* that follows. It is at the opening of *De Bono Pat.*, and Cyprian always bestows his best rhetoric upon the beginning and end of his writings.

[4] *Adhuc insuper* is confined to a short period of Cyprian's writings. It occurs four times in *Ep.* 59, once in 67, once in 73, twice in *Ad Dem.*, once in

22, 24, 681. 2, &c., *adhuc insuper et* 404. 19, *post ista adhuc insuper* 683. 8, *et post ista adhuc insuper et* 685. 13 (cf. *et post ista adhuc* 403. 1), *immo adhuc insuper* 779. 16. *Adhuc usque* 495. 18, 679. 13 appears to be first used by Tertullian; *quoad usque* 301. 14 had been already used in the O. L. Bible.

Copulative conjunctions are constantly multiplied; *et . . . quoque* 598. 5, *nec . . . quoque* 427. 22, *etiam . . . et* 677. 22, *adhuc quoque* 750. 13, *sed et* constantly (see Hartel's *Index*), *sed nec*, *sed neque* 319. 21, 390. 9, 517, 11, 631. 14, 805. 1, &c., *nec non et* 238. 14, 318. 23, 339. 19, &c., *nec non . . . quoque* 409. 14; cf. *nec non etiam . . . quoque* of Novatian, 551. 12. *Pariter et* is of constant occurrence, e.g. 600. 11, 21, almost always connecting long words; *simul et* is rare; to Hartel's list should perhaps be added 510. 3; *similiter et* only 399. 8. *Denuo quoque* occurs 190. 8, *item denuo* often, 374. 6, 751. 2, &c. *Porro autem* is common in Cyprian's latest writings, 374. 21, 419. 7, and in the *Epp.* on the Baptismal controversy. The only earlier instance is in *Ep.* 58, 659. 8. *Scilicet certe* is read once, in a badly written passage, 339. 8. The list of otiose conjunctions might be made much longer.

Prepositions are used otiosely with *uicarius* and *solus*; *pro me . . . uicarias litteras* 480. 13, and similarly 587. 13, 656. 14, 697. 20, *me solum sine uobis* 593. 6 and so 294. 12; cf. 594. 23 *sibi soli.*

It remains to notice certain cases of *contingere*, *debere*, *esse*, *posse* used simply to expand the sentence; 432. 12 *peruenire . . . ut eum uidere contingat* = *uideamus*, 547. 5 *quorum tempora inlustrauit tanta felicitas ut aetate nostra uidere contingeret probatos seruos Dei* sq., 509. 13 *quamquam causa conpelleret ut ipse ad uos properare et uenire deberem*, and similarly 827. 21[1];

B. Pat.; once also in *Ep.* 75 (826. 8). The combination is not noticed by Georges under either word.

[1] Yet this *debere* may be purely auxiliary; cf. Cod. Lugd. *Gen.* 29. 21 *ut introire deberem* = ὅπως εἰσέλθω, cited by Thielmann in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 2. 65, and 487. 6 in the Roman *Ep.* 8. *Coepisse* and *incipere* are certainly used by Cyprian as strict auxiliaries.

510. 22 *si qui sunt qui . . . indigeant*, 502. 11 *utinam loci conditio permitteret ut ipse nunc praesens esse possem*, 404. 17, 505. 12, &c.; cf. 602. 18, cited on p. 222. *Videri*, again, is used superfluously in a number of passages where there is certainly no idea of seeming, as 309. 27 *spei nostrae et fidei praeuaricatores sumus, si simulata, si ficta, si fucata uidentur esse quae dicimus*, where *uidentur esse* must be for *sunt*; cf. 223. 15, 227. 10, 714. 8, 761. 10, 809. 12, &c.[1]

§ 20. Hitherto examples of amplification have been chosen which were not cases of *figura etymologica*, or other rhetorical devices. Of *figura etymologica* in the strict sense[2] there are not many instances in Cyprian. Taking them in Landgraf's order, the following is perhaps a complete list; 259. 15 *induere indumenta*, 432. 11 *curricula decurrere*, 578. 21 *uita uiuitur*, 512. 4 *superantem superare*, 621. 17 and 725. 9 *tenere tenorem*, 710. 14 *poto poculo*[3]; 425. 21 *inluminati Christi lumine*, 501. 7 *oratione communi . . . orantes*, 672. 8 *discidio scindere* (cf. 231. 9), 768. 14 *unctione unctus*; 728. 14 *episcopum episcopi et iudicem iudicis*; 3. 4 *tempestiuum tempus*, 238. 2 and 723. 15 *sacrificia sacrilega*, 399. 5 *sacra sacrilega*; 465. 4 and 581. 5 *praesens adesse*; 408. 19 and constantly *omnis omnino*; 473. 2 *continenter tenere.* Besides these there only remains *magis ac magis*, already mentioned; *magis magisque* is never used by Cyprian.

§ 21. Sufficient evidence has been given to show that Cyprian's style is that of a man so thoroughly trained in a rhetorical school that he never, even in his most hasty writing, fails to show his education. It is a style which is essentially

[1] Some instances are purely passive, as 622. 15 *etsi uidentur in ecclesia esse zizania*, which states that they are, not that they seem to be, present, 673. 19 *cum talis . . . inpugnari uidetur, apparet quis inpugnet.* There is a strange passive use of *uideri* in *De Rebapt.* 7 (A 78. 9).

[2] As defined by G. Landgraf in *Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis*, vol. ii. pp. 1–69, '*conpositio duorum congenerum uocabulorum quae item grammaticae legibus artissime inter se conexa unam eamque amplificatam atque disertissimam notionem efficiant.*'

[3] The frequent *oblationem offerre*, since it is a fixed part of the Christian vocabulary, cannot be regarded as an instance of *accusatiuus etymologicus.*

one with that of Apuleius, and had no doubt been learnt by both on African soil. But how far it was peculiar to Africa is a more doubtful point. In its literary aspect it is closely akin to that of Ammianus and the Panegyrists; in its grammatical to that of Vitruvius [1]. Though it is certain that provincial peculiarities existed, and certain also that many of them have been detected, yet the unconscious degeneration of grammar and the conscious efforts after rotundity of expression were common to the whole empire. A constant emigration seems to have been going on from southern Italy to Carthage, as now to Buenos Ayres, and the connexion between Rome and Africa could not have been closer than it was. Africans of Roman descent no doubt did their best to retain, and the educated natives to assume, the characteristics in language and otherwise of Italians. It is therefore dangerous to regard as peculiarities of African writers what may only appear to be such, because comparatively little has survived of the literature of other provinces in the third century. What would have been the strongest possible evidence, could it have been sustained, a Semitic element in African Latin, has been abandoned by the author of the theory [2]. There are of course local elements in the style of Cyprian as of other writers, and the present tendency of inquirers is certainly not to underestimate them; but his style is undoubtedly that of an educated, though careless, Latin writer, trained in and satisfied with the fashions of his day. There is no sign that he had any training but the rhetorical. Legal terms occasionally occur; but every Roman knew something of law, and nothing indicates that Cyprian had a professional knowledge. Of philosophy, in spite of his acquaintance with Seneca, he shows no sign. That formal logic, of which Novatian makes so pedantic a display, and in which his

[1] As set out in J. Praun's *Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruv*, Bamberg, 1885.

[2] K. Sittl, *Lokale Verschiedenheiten*, p. 92 ff. He surrenders it, with some reservations, in the *Jahresbericht*, 1892, p. 246. Yet is not *unctus Dei* for *a Deo* 768. 14 a Hebraism?

philosophy, derided by Cyprian, appears to have consisted [1], is never employed. His full command of all the technical devices of the rhetorician, chastened only to some extent by the seriousness of his thought, his amplitude of expression and the smoothness with which his periods move—it would be possible to collect from the few pages of Cornelius almost as many abrupt transitions as from all Cyprian's writings,—the copiousness and originality of his vocabulary, all display him as one who exercised the thoughts and the culture of the old world upon the problems of the new. It is recognized now that the older scholars were wrong in classing together all the Christian authors as writers of ecclesiastical Latin. No such Latin existed till the monasteries were established, and the great Fathers had written. And there is no author to whose style the term can be less appropriately applied than Cyprian.

[1] Fronto also (*De Eloquentia*, p. 146, Naber) appears to regard formal logic as of the essence of philosophy, and ridicules it accordingly. Cf. Ps.-Apul. *De Dogm. Plat.* iii. p. 272 Oud. (ed. Goldbacher in *Wiener Studien*, 1885, p. 267. 10), and Apul. *Flor.* 1. 7.

CHAPTER II.

LANGUAGE.

§ 1. *Deus*, &c. § 2. Divine action, creation, miracles, law. § 3. Divine favour and disfavour. § 4. Christ and His work. § 5. The Holy Spirit, prophecy, visions. § 6. Scripture. § 7. Types. § 8. *Christianus, fidelis*, &c. § 9. *Ecclesia*, &c. § 10. Laity. § 11. Bishop. § 12. Other Orders and Ordination. § 13. Councils. § 14. Proselytes and catechumens. § 15. Baptism and accompanying Rites. § 16. The Eucharist. § 17. Prayer. § 18. The place of worhsip. § 19. Preaching. § 20. Manner of address, *frater*, &c. § 21. Payment of the clergy. § 22. Christian virtues. § 23. Alms. § 24. Christian conduct and progress. § 25. Sin and Penitence. § 26. Freewill and conscience. § 27. Death and Heaven. § 28. The devil and hell. § 29. World and Heathen. § 30. Persecution, Confession, Martyrdom and Lapse. § 31. Heresy. § 32. Greek words. § 33. New and rare substantives. § 34. Adjectives. § 35. Pronouns. § 36. Verbs. § 37. Adverbs and Conjunctions. § 38. Prepositions, &c.

In this chapter the attempt is made to give a full account of the theological and ecclesiastical terms used by Cyprian. The subject is that of language, not of doctrine or history, and though the latter cannot be avoided, and indeed it is hoped that this paper may be of use for their study, they have not been introduced except in illustration of the words employed. Illustration from other writers has been avoided, and the history of words before and after Cyprian's day passed over, unless light could in some way be thrown upon Cyprian's motive in using them. Biblical terms also, and especially those of St. Paul, have been omitted, as belonging to the common stock of all Christian writers.

In Cyprian's day the Latin tongue was still adjusting itself to the Faith, and the Christian vocabulary was unsettled. Cyprian was one of those who had most influence in fixing it. A good deal may be learnt, not only from the words

which he used, but from those which he avoided or attempted to displace, of the course of Christian thought as well as of the Latin language. His hostility to Greek terms, for instance, which I have illustrated, must be regarded as an early sign of severance between Eastern and Western Christendom. But the limits of this paper leave room only for the statement of facts, not for the drawing of conclusions. I have concluded with a selection of new and rare words, not of Christian significance. Want of space has compelled me to omit much that is interesting in this respect.

§ 1. *Deus*, with Cyprian's love for abstracts, is paraphrased in many ways, e.g. 519. 16 *quando . . . nos diuina protectio reduces ad ecclesiam suam fecerit*; 680. 16 *ne uulneratos diuina clementia in ecclesia sua curet*; *diuina censura* 496. 19, 737. 8, &c.; *diuina maiestas*, *pietas*, *benignitas*, *bonitas*, *indulgentia*, *dignatio* 250. 21, 274. 5, 579. 3, &c.

Deitas is not used by Cyprian. It first occurs in *De Aleatt.* 7 (A 100. 9); an evidence, as far as it goes, for the later authorship of that tract. *Diuinitas*, in the only passage where Cyprian uses it (339. 26), perhaps stands for *diuinatio*, though a comparison with 661. 19 renders this doubtful. *Trinitas* occurs 292. 6, 782. 4, 791. 22, after Tertullian; *diuina firmitas* 215. 7 must mean union of Persons.

Though *Dominus*, when it stands alone, is normally for *Christus*, yet *Deus* and *Dominus* are also used interchangeably and in combination; for rhetorical purposes they often occur at the ends of parallel clauses, e.g. 232. 22 *diem Domini et iram Dei*, 757. 3 *dignatione Dei et ordinatione Domini*. In 320. 13 *praeferamus . . . Deum et Christum diabolo et antichristo* Cyprian has gained three rhetorical figures at the cost of one false antithesis.

Beside *diuinus* the adjective *deificus* occurs. The word, which seems to belong to vulgar Latin [1], is used rarely and

[1] It is used by the illiterate Lucianus in *Ep.* 22 (533. 12), in *De Aleatt.* 11 (A 103. 16), several times in the *De Montibus*, by the translator of *Ep.* 75 (815. 4), in *Sent.* 8 (441. 9). Cyprian only uses the word thrice, and each time deliberately, for the sake of parataxis with *Deus*; 429. 15, 618. 22, 742.

only for a special rhetorical purpose instead of the usual *diuinus*, for which *caelestis* is a frequent substitute. *Dominicus*, which is very common, seems to be used indefinitely, e. g. 430. 16 *sit in manibus diuina lectio, in sensibus dominica cogitatio*, where the words are simply used for variety, as with *Deus* and *Dominus* above, as well as in the strict sense, e. g. *dominica confessio* (of Christ) 319. 15, 656. 21, though the latter is more usual. *Dominicus* (sc. *dies*) = Sunday 581. 8; for *dominicum* = *eucharistia* see p. 266; *spiritalis*, in the corresponding sense, is also common [1].

§ 2. Divine action is often expressed by *diuinitus*, 432. 1, 689. 4, &c.; by *prouidenter*, for alliteration, 607. 19; by *desuper* in 356. 7 for the same reason; by *caelitus* in the rhetorical *Ad Donatum*, 6. 5. Similarly *spiritaliter*, e. g. *quod spiritaliter praecipitur* = *a Spiritu sancto*, 713. 19; cf. *humanitus laedunt persecutiones*, i. e. 'inflicted by men,' 366. 10.

Acts of power such as miracles are *magnalia*, *mirabilia*, both several times, *magnalia et mirabilia* 674. 9, *mirabilia uirtutum* 401. 8, *uirtutes* 223. 17, and often. *Miraculum* occurs in the sense of *miratio* 581. 3, 583. 23, not in that of miracle. The nearest approach to it is 582. 15 *conluctationis miraculum* = *conluctatio mirabilis*; cf. 195. 1 *quibus multa magnalia cum miraculo faceret* = *mirifice* [2].

Cyprian does not often mention the work of creation [3].

21. In 429. 15, 742. 21 there is the further reason that to write *diuina disciplina*, as would have been natural, would be contrary to his rules of composition; see p. 223. Tertullian's *deus deificus* (active) in *Apol.* 11 is probably a coinage of his own; the word is carefully avoided by the more classical of the Christian writers; even Lucifer and Lactantius, in spite of their debt to Cyprian, reject it. It certainly in Cyprian has no meaning other than that of *diuinus*; cf. *regifico luxu* Virgil. *Aen.* 6. 605, *castificus* Sen. *Phaedr.* 169.

[1] Beside this use *spiritalis* is constantly used as practically equivalent to *Christianus* or *sincerus*, e. g. 428. 10, 545. 9, 583. 8. *Caelestis* and *spiritalis* are very often combined; 192. 22, 239. 9, 320. 20, 621. 8, &c.

[2] This use of *cum* is very common in Cyprian; 588. 15 *cum pace* = *pacifice*, 232. 10 *cum fiducia* = *fidenter*, &c.

[3] Of the numerous passages in which the Vulgate has *Creator*, *creare*, *creatura*, there are singularly few in Cyprian. The only one of these words

Creare, I think, does not occur, *creatura* twice, in a concrete sense, 708. 12, 768. 17, *creator* only 792. 4 *negans Deum creatorem Christi*[1]. *Facere* seems to be the usual equivalent for *creare*, with *factor*, 662. 7, 718. 15; cf. 319. 19[2], and *factura*, in a rhetorical passage, 198. 7. In the *De Hab. Virg.*, adapted from Tertullian, he borrows that writer's *plastica* and *protoplastus* 198. 7, 190. 15; *plasmare* in 804. 18 is an allusion to Sap. 15. 11; *diuinum plasma*, 468. 12, is some evidence that *Ep.* 2 belongs to an earlier date than O. Ritschl's arguments indicate. When Cyprian's style was matured he avoided, as far as possible, the use of Greek words. *Instituere* is used for *creare* 201. 28, *institutio* 468. 10; *institutor* is so used by Tertullian and Lactantius. *Artifex* is used 198. 20, 201. 27, not, I think, *opifex*, though *opus* is found, 198. 7, &c.[3]

The usual words for God's law and appointment are *dispositio* (*Test.* 1. 11 *tit. dispositio et testamentum*), *institutio*, *ordinatio*, *traditio*, and *lex*[4]. *Praescriptio* in the legal sense seems the

which they contain is *creatura*, Ecclus. 24. 5, Col. 1. 15 (62. 15, 63. 16). In Dan. 14. 4 (337. 20, 661. 13) and Mal. 2. 10 (114. 16) *condere* takes the place of the Vulgate *creare*. In Eph. 4. 24 κτισθείς is translated by *constitutus* (124. 23) instead of *creatus*, as in the Vulgate. There are no other passages in which *creare* or its cognates might have been expected. In the contemporary *Ad Nov.* 4 (A 56. 13) Gen. 6. 7 reads *perdam hominem quem feci*.

[1] This seems a reference to Heb. 3. 2, where *Clarom.* reads *creatori suo*, and the Old Latin MSS. generally that or *qui creauit eum*; Vulgate *ei qui fecit illum*. There is another possible reference to Heb. 4. 12 in 271. 21 *inpetrabilis et efficax sermo*. Since Tertullian knew the Epistle it is incredible that Cyprian was ignorant of it, though he would not cite it as Scripture.

[2] *Creare* is not even used, when it might naturally have been expected, of the divine appointment of Bishops, but always *facere*, *constituere*, &c., though *creare pseudoepiscopum* occurs 642. 22. In fact, through its use by Marcion, the word seems to have gained a heretical connotation, of which this may be a survival. Tertullian very rarely uses it except in reference to the *deus Marcionis* (*Adu. Marc.* constantly, *Carn. Xti* 2, *Res. Carn.* 2, *Prax.* 3, &c.), the true God being *conditor*. *Soter* has similarly suffered through Gnostic use (Tert. *Adu. Val.*, *passim*); cf. Cyprian's rejection of *tinctio*.

[3] Koffmane, p. 67, states that *condere* is used by Cyprian for *creare*. He does not give a reference, and I have noticed no instance, except *conditor* in *Ep.* 75 (824. 12).

[4] *Lex* is used both generally for God's commandments and, in the Scriptural

true reading in 736. 11, and not Hartel's *perscriptio*; cf. 373. 17.

§ 3. Cyprian's characteristic words for God's bearing to men are *censura*, *dignatio*, *indulgentia*, *bonitas*, and *pietas*. *Bonitas* always and *pietas* almost always—perhaps 388. 12, 19 are the only exceptions—are used of Divine goodness, not of human.

Censura may imply either approval (252. 6, &c.) or condemnation, e. g. 670. 14, which is more usual. It is also often used in a general sense, meaning little more than majesty, as in 682. 14, 413. 22, in which it is coupled with *maiestas*, according to Cyprian's usual practice of combining synonyms[1]. *Dignatio* is one of the most common of Cyprian's words, especially in the alliterative phrase *de Dei dignatione*. As a rule it is rather equivalent to favour than to grace, though it describes internal as well as external gifts, e. g. 275. 6, 656. 15, and 716. 23 *benigna et larga d. corda inluminat*. But more commonly it is used of some visible mark of favour, as the episcopate, 546. 19, 651. 9, 671. 20 and often, confessorship or martyrdom, 251. 16, 673. 14, 695. 6, or other Divine

sense, for the Old Testament. Beside many classical uses (271. 14, 293. 20, 302. 1, 304. 9, &c.), it is curiously employed, followed by a genitive, in such passages as 285. 11 *ad altare uenire cum simplici corde, cum lege iustitiae, cum concordiae pace*. The two last are paraphrased just afterwards by the simple *iustitia* and *pax*. So 232. 21 in *Dei timore, in lege iustitiae, in dilectione, in opere fides nulla est*, 336. 27 *Deo innocentiae lege deuoti*. In these and in many more passages *lex* seems simply superfluous. In 218. 25 *qui se praepositos sine ulla ordinationis lege constituunt* there is a very Cyprianic equivalent for *ordinatio legitima*. *Legitimus* in Cyprian has not only this meaning of lawful, but also that of appointed by law; 338. 11 *numerus legitimus et certus*, 292. 12 *legitima ad precem tempora*. It comes to mean genuine; 760. 16 *legitimi Christiani*, 762. 8 *legitima fides*, 708. 10 *legitima sanctificatio* (*sacrificii*).

[1] *Censura*, which is very frequent, is used of Bishops and others in several senses. The most usual is that of judicial strictness, e. g. 668. 22; also of jurisdiction, or the right to judge, as 189. 20; of obedience to discipline, or loyalty, 625. 15, &c.; of reproof administered, as 623. 18, or sentence passed, as 758. 2. Once at least it is used in a bad sense, 639. 2 *uel duritiae uel censurae suae obstinatione*. In the sense of severity it is used by Tert., and is common in the Hist. Aug. except Vopiscus (Krebs, *Rhein. Mus.* 1892, p. 48).

help, 346. 5, 422. 13, 500. 9, 13, 801. 15. A partial converse is *diuina indignatio* 363. 19, 521. 16. The word is not used of human action. *Indulgentia* occurs constantly in the two senses, both found in Tertullian, of favour and goodness, e.g. 579. 3, 432. 14, in which it is often interchangeable with *dignatio*, as 656. 12 *plebs cui de diuina indulgentia praesumus*, and of forgiveness, e.g. 403. 5 *indulgentia criminis*, 249. 21, 628. 12, &c.

§ 4. *Sermo Dei* is constant, though Tertullian wavers between *Sermo* and *Verbum*. The rendering in Cyprian's version of the Bible seems always to have been *Sermo*. *Concarnatio* occurs once, 60. 5; *incarnatio* never, though *incarnatus* is found in Novatian, *Trin.* 19. Koffmane, p. 42, only knows Hilary of Poitiers as using *concarnatio* in this sense. It was perhaps an unsuccessful coinage of Cyprian. *In uno omnes ipse portauit*, 271. 13, describes the work of the Incarnation; so also 277. 2, 711. 12, 754. 8; cf. Is. 63. 9. Tertullian does not use the phrase; cf. p. 308. *Aduentus* is used both of the first and second Coming, 211. 8, 414. 21, &c. *Passio*[1] 471. 2, and *resurrectio*, are of course common. *Adscensus*, never *adscensio*, is used, 471. 17, &c.

Christus is much more common than *Dominus* or compound titles; the full *Dominus noster Iesus Christus* is very rare; *Dominus Iesus* only occurs in the solemn salutation at the end of the last letter, 842. 9. *Deus et Christus eius*, which occurs so often (see Hartel's *Index Verborum*, s. v. *ellipsis* and *is*, and add 838. 15), may have been misunderstood by Cyprian, as Hartel suggests, for an ellipse of *filius*[2].

Saluare[3] is only used thrice, 790. 20, 809. 6, 12, *Saluator*

[1] *Passio* is often used of the martyrs, 578. 2, &c., and in the plural as well as in the singular, e. g. 662. 22, 833. 9.

[2] See a good article on this *eius* by F. Piper in *Zschr. für Kirchengesch.* 1890, p. 67. In Tertullian I have only noticed one instance, in *Bapt.* 9 (208. 19 Reiff.).

[3] Cf. Wölfflin in *Sitzungsberichte* of the Munich Academy, 1893, p. 263 f. *Saluator* is used by the illiterate Celerinus, 529. 12. Tertullian rejects it, though it stood in his Bible, and is constant in Irenaeus. Cyprian never uses Tertullian's *salutificator*, for which add *Marc.* 5. 15 to Oehler's list.

once, 60. 12. These are passages in which Cyprian is making no attempt at style. In rhetorical passages he twice uses *sospitare*, 188. 25, 211. 9; see p. 196. *Seruare* occurs 214. 19, 505. 15, and cf. 319. 20; *reseruare* 373. 13, 640. 20, *conseruare* 279. 15, and *conseruator* 827. 17, as in Tert. *Res. Carn.* 58 *fin.*, *Cult. Fem.* 1. 3. *Saluus fieri* is used occasionally, e.g. 751. 16, 809. 11; *saluus adque incolumis* 367. 10; *Domino et Deo nostro Salutari* 614. 8, the only instance of this Biblical use (Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 100). Cyprian uses *Mediator* only in 60. 19. The Biblical *redemptio* and *Redemptor* are used, e.g. 188. 23, 639. 15, 713. 8, and also *redimere*, e.g. 370. 16; but the verb is commonly employed of human effort by alms, &c., as in 195. 24, 377. 9. Other expressions for the Saviour's work are *peccata portare* 401. 13, 711. 13[1], *remittere* constantly[2], *donare* 249. 21, &c.; *curare, emundare, purgare*, are used indifferently of Divine and human action. *Reparare* 370. 22, 394. 9, &c., *reconciliare Deo* 370. 17 also occur. *Aduocatus* is frequent; *aduocatus et deprecator* occurs twice, 499. 18, 637. 7[3]. *Iudicium* is rarely further described; *cognitio* is an occasional variant. The two are combined 659. 5. *Retributio*, as the

[1] From Is. 53. 4 (*Test.* 2. 13, p. 77, 20). The same reading is in Aug. *C. D.* 18. 29 (Dombart, ed. 2, ii. 295. 6).

[2] The corresponding substantive is *remissa* or *remissio*. The former occurs 19 times, I think, the latter 14 times, in Cyprian's own writing. The latter stood in the African Baptismal question (e. g. 756. 14), and it is usually when speaking directly of this formula that Cyprian uses it, yet not always; cf. 250. 3. The neuter pl. *remissa* (cf. Weyman in Wölfflin's *Archiv* 9. 138), though it has important MS. support, is not likely to be Cyprianic. In the *Sententiae* and in *Ep.* 73 *remissio* is the usual form. This differentiation of form, combined with the constant African use of *saeculum* for the *mundus* which still stood in the Baptismal Service, and was used, though rarely, by Cyprian, shows that Christianity must have been of some considerable antiquity in Africa when Cyprian wrote. These and other differences from the language of the parent Church in Italy must have required the lapse of several generations, especially since they arose between Churches only three days' journey apart.

[3] Mr. H. J. White regards *deprecator* in these passages as equivalent to *propitiator*, since in 1 John 2. 2 (637. 11) ἱλασμός is translated by *deprecatio*, as is ἐξιλασμός in the Vulgate (i. e. O. L.) Sap. 18. 21; but it would be more in accordance with the style of Cyprian that the two words should be practically synonyms.

result of judgment, is reward, 344. 18, &c.; the only exception I have noted is 399. 15. *Vindicta* for punishment is common.

§ 5. There is no variant for *Spiritus Sanctus*. The *sanctus* is rarely omitted, 204. 10, 301. 17, &c., and rarely precedes, though this is contrary to Cyprian's custom. *Praedicere* and *praedicare* occur constantly, the latter as a substitute for *euangelizare*, which Cyprian never uses. There seems to be no clear instance of *praedicare* wrongly used for *praedicere*. *Denuntiare* is used in the same sense 217. 14. For the Divine fulfilment of Scripture the Biblical *adimplere* is used [1].

Inspiratio and *reuelatio*, e. g. 787. 15, where both occur, are common; *adspirare* 841. 10. *Ostensio*, *ostendere* are used of the giving of visions, e. g. 497. 9, 498. 9, 651. 7. Where *ostendere* is used without the mode of revelation being named, as in 567. 21, it is safe to assume that a vision is implied [2]. *Visio* also is found, e. g. 734. 8. *In Spiritu* occurs 692. 10, &c.; *in ecstasi* only 520. 7 [3]. *Canere* and *praecanere*, both from Tertullian, occur several times, e. g. 375. 19, 706. 13; *diuino spiritu et instinctu*, 359. 6, is used of prophetic inspiration. *Instinctus* [4] in this sense occurs again 255. 16; *instigare* 656. 15, 698. 22. *Spiritus confessionis* is read 338. 26, *spiritus diuinitatis* 339. 26.

§ 6. It will be most convenient here to deal with Cyprian's language concerning Scripture, which he so often attributes to the Holy Spirit [5]. The singular *Scriptura* is much more

[1] Add to Hartel's list 225. 6; in different senses 255. 15, 256. 15, 776. 1.

[2] *Ostendere* is so used *Pass. Perp.* §§ 4, 7, 8.

[3] *Pass. Perp.* 20 *adeo in spiritu et in extasi fuerat.* The word is used by Tertullian. In *Ep.* 75 (817. 4) *mulier in ecstasin constituta* it cannot be an ablative, as Koffmane (p. 36) would have it. It must be a rendering of εἰς ἔκστασιν πεσοῦσα, or something similar.

[4] But *instinctus* is more often to evil; 421. 11, 588. 9, 645. 12. *Instinguere*, though used by Tertullian, never occurs in Cyprian.

[5] Cyprian's mode of citation is very uniform. He almost always uses two synonymous verbs in his love of pleonasm; *Deus, Christus, Spiritus Sanctus, Apostolus loquitur et dicit.* In *Ep.* 68 occur the forms *docens et praecipiens, ponit et dicit, docens et ostendens* (twice), *loquens et dicens, mandauit et dixit, ostenditur et probatur, contestatur et dicit, probat et declarat, loquitur et dicit,*

common than *Scripturae*. The standing epithets are *sancta* and *diuina*; *sacra* does not occur. Variants are very rare; *caelestes Scripturae* 254. 9, *dominicae* 538. 5. The other names for Scripture in Cyprian are *disciplina*[1] (*d. caelestis* 287. 25), *lectio*, which clearly has this meaning in 270. 20, 318. 11, 430. 16 (*sit in manibus diuina lectio*), and elsewhere; *libri spiritales* 36. 19; *Scripturae ueteres et nouae* 36. 18, 375. 17. *Testamentum* and *instrumentum* in this sense do not occur. More general terms are *praecepta* 101. 11, 238. 17, &c., and *magisteria*[2], which is very common, and probably derived from the Old Latin New Testament; cf. 193. 6, 522. 15, 738. 16, and especially 505. 15. These words are used with a great wealth of epithets, *diuinus*, *spiritalis*, *caelestis*, *sanctus*, *salutaris*, *uitalis*, *euangelicus*. The legal term *capitula* is used for verses or sections of Scripture, 36. 2, 220. 8, 318. 10, as in Tertullian, but Tertullian's *tituli* is absent.

In the Old Testament *Lex* is not only used alone, but once at least with the genitive of a part; *lex Exodi* 217. 9. Tertullian's *Arithmi* and *Critae* have disappeared, but in the *Testimonia* the true reading is *in Basilion primo*, &c., as against Hartel's *A*, which has almost always *Regnorum*. But elsewhere *Basilion* is not found in the writings of Cyprian; one among many evidences that that work was compiled before Cyprian had settled upon his vocabulary. He uses instead *Regnorum*, or else, and more often, avoids naming the book. Similarly in 142. 3, 329. 7, the only passages where they are named, we read *apud*, *in Paralipomenon*. The same

declarat dicens, addidit dicens, scribit et dicit. Cf. in *Ep.* 74. 3 *clamat et dicit, increpans et obiurgans ponit et dicit, commonet et instruit dicens.* In 425. 20 *Apostolus Paulus instruens et monens ut . . . scribit et dicit.* The instances are very rare where Cyprian is content with the simple *Scriptura dicit* or an equivalent.

[1] If Wölfflin in his *Archiv*, viii. p. 11, is right; cf. 468. 1, 230. 5. In all these instances the meaning might be the usual one, yet certainly in Firm. Mat. *De Err.* 19. 5 *quid nobis tradat euangelica disciplina* means Scripture.

[2] Cf. Rendel Harris, *Cod. Sangall.* p. 25. In that MS. *magisterium uel doctrina* occurs as the rendering of διδασκαλία. He compares Irenaeus, 3. 14. 3.

ellipse occurs 338. 8, and often in the *Testimonia*, with *Basilion* and *Regnorum*. *In Paroemiis* is the regular mode of citation for the book of Proverbs; *in Prooemiis*, 62. 3, can only be a *lapsus calami*. There is some little evidence for *in Parabolis*, 62. 3, 154. 4, though it is not likely to be Cyprian's. Very often the book is included with the other sapiential books, as *in Sapientia*, e. g. 128. 13, 156. 17. In 672. 22 the Minor Prophets are cited collectively; *in duodecim prophetis*. Cf. Tert. *adu. Marc.* 4. 13 *Naum ex duodecim*, and *Adu. Jud.* 5. The other names of books offer nothing noteworthy [1], unless it be that he has *Malachin* (nom. and acc.) twice, 293. 13, 413. 17, and perhaps also 94. 22, *Malachiel* twice at least, 68. 3, 138. 19, against *Malachias* thrice certainly (50. 7, 114. 16, 157. 15), and probably also in 97. 3.

Euangelium [2] is, with one exception, used in the singular, the Gospels being regarded as an undivided whole. Except in the *Testimonia* the form employed is *Dominus in Euangelio suo dicit*, &c., the personal agency of the Evangelists being ignored. In the *Testimonia*, where more exact citation had to be given, *Euangelium cata Matthaeum*, &c. is the description. The evidence for *secundum* is inadequate, and its use improbable [3]. Cyprian never follows Tertullian in speaking of *Euangelium Matthaei*, &c. *Euangelia quattuor*, the only example of the plural, occurs 785. 20. *Acta*, not *Actus*, *Apostolorum* is always used.

Cyprian is very careful not to cite Scripture without acknowledgement. He never allows himself, as does Tertullian, to fall into continuous Scripture language without giving

[1] Koffmane, p. 10, notes that *psalmus* is very often used in Cyprian for a verse of a psalm. But when Cyprian writes *psalmus dicit*, &c. he simply personifies the single Psalm, as he does when he writes *Apocalypsis dicit* 342. 21, 663. 5. He recognized them as separate compositions; in the *Testimonia* he gives the number, and his usual citation is *in Psalmis*.

[2] Beside this normal use of *euangelium*, *euangelicus*, it is also used for the Faith as a whole, and practically as an equivalent for *ecclesia*, e. g. 248. 26 *nec ecclesiae iungitur qui ab euangelio separatur*, 687. 3 *sacerdos Dei euangelium tenens*, cf. 544. 12.

[3] Cf. Zahn, *Neutest. Kanon*, 1. 164, n. 5.

notice of the fact. The only instances where short passages are quoted without warning are, so far as I have observed, 228. 23, 290. 21, 379. 21, 507. 7, 711. 2. Beside *Dominus &c. dicit*, *Scriptura* is frequently personified as the speaker. The impersonal *inquit* appears occasionally, e. g. 738. 18, 23; and similarly *quando occurrat dicens* 668. 23; for these cf. Miodoński's note to *De Aleatt.* p. 61.

§ 7. Cyprian had frequent occasion to show that the facts of the Christian Faith are foreshown in the Old Testament. For type he appears only once to use *mysterium* 86. 6; *typus* often, e. g. 269. 11, 386. 25, 704. 11, but, with his usual dislike of Greek words, more often *imago*, e. g. 189. 14, 367. 16, 702. 24, or *figura*, as 217. 10, 705. 2. Once *instar* occurs, 785. 17; *umbra et imago* 328. 4, 719. 25; *praefiguratio* 763. 14; *signum et sacramentum* 216. 13, 330. 19; *sacramentum*[1]

[1] As this is the first occasion on which I have to refer to this word, I will here try to classify its uses in Cyprian. This is not easy, as the various meanings often overlap, and the word in many instances was used with intentional vagueness. It is used twice of the military oath; 246. 12 *sacramenti mei memor deuotionis et fidei arma suscepi*; and 806. 4. Of loyalty to that oath, 491. 21 *spectaculum quam sublime . . . quam Dei oculis sacramento et deuotione militis eius acceptum.* In a very common sense it comes to mean a *bond*, however it may have attained the meaning; e. g. 754. 15 *inseparabile unitatis s.*, 215. 7 *unitas sacramentis caelestibus cohaerens*; ib. 11 *unitatis s., uinculum concordiae*, which are identical phrases; so also 639. 5 *manente concordiae uinculo et perseuerante catholicae ecclesiae sacramento*; 668. 8 *copulati sacramento unanimitatis.* The action of heretics, &c. on this bond is described 241. 21 as *soluere*, 808. 22 *inpugnare*, 794. 10 *mutilare*, 227. 19 *disturbare.* Also a rule or law, as 600. 4 *s. semel traditum diuinae dispositionis et catholicae unitatis*, cf. 551. 8 (Novatian). A doctrine, sometimes with the connotation of mystery, e. g. 36. 13 *item libellus alius continet Christi s., quod idem uenerit qui adnuntiatus est* sq., *Test.* 3. 50 *tit. s. fidei non esse profanandum*; ib. 2. 2 *tit. de sacramento concarnationis eius et passionis* sq.; 288. 1 *sic cum doceret quid sit uita aeterna s. uitae magna et diuina breuitate conplexus est*; 710. 2, 713. 9, &c. Similarly in *Ep.* 77 (834. 7) Nemesianus says *dum non desinis occulta sacramenta nudare.* From this meaning it seems to be extended to that of lesson generally; 272. 8 *qualia sunt dominicae orationis sacramenta, quam magna* sq. From the meaning of mystery comes that of type, in which mysterious teaching is conveyed; this is very common, e. g. 292. 6, 13, 337. 27, 764. 8, 808. 23, &c.; of symbolical action in 83. 12 *sacramento unctionis Christum significans*; an instance or example 763. 13; cf. 702. 14 *Christus . . . qui scripturarum omnium sacramento ac testimonio*

alone very often. The verbs used are *typum*, *figuram*, &c. *exprimere* 702. 24, &c., which is the most common; *gerere* 386. 26; *portare* 269. 11; *praemonstrare* 704. 12; *ostendere* 702. 23. The type as representing its antitype is said *designare*; 752. 21 *qui agnus designabat Christum*; *praeformare* 217. 4[1], *exprimere* 338. 25, *praefigurare* 328. 5, *initiare* 403. 27, *Abel passionem Christi initians*, and 285. 13. *Veritas*, as in 367. 16, 702. 23, and *respondere*, as 593. 21, stand for the antitype.

§ 8. *Christianus* is common, but less common than might have been expected. It is rare as an adjective, *Christianum nomen* 211. 15, *patientia* 404. 15, *unanimitas* 754. 4, and a few more. When used as a substantive it always seems to have the connotation of a good Christian, and to be reserved for somewhat emphatic passages. *Fidelis*, on the other hand, is a colourless term; cf. in *Test.* 3. the titles §§ 34, 37, 44, 57, 87. Caldonius can use it even of lapsed persons, 537. 4; Tertullian *Fug.* 1 includes renegades under the term, and *Ieiun.* 11 contrasts it with *Spiritalis*, i. e. Montanist. Similarly *fides* appears to be used simply for the fact of Baptism in *Test.* 3. 11 *tit. eum qui fidem consecutus est*, and *ib.* 97 *tit.*, as in Tertullian *Monog.* 11 *maritus a fide primus*, and *Pud.* 18[2].

praedicetur, i. e. witness both typical and direct. In 710. 23 it appears to mean not the type but the teaching which it conveys. The word is used frequently in the modern meaning of sacrament; e. g. *baptismi s.* 795. 24; *s. salutare* (i. e. Baptism) 761. 2; *si sacramento utroque nascantur* (i. e. Baptism and *manus impositio*) 775. 16, 795. 12, and *Sent.* 5 (439. 9). So of the Eucharist, 431. 17 *de sacramento crucis et cibum et potum sumis*; and even of the elements, 255. 19 *diaconus reluctanti licet de sacramento calicis infudit*, where *de* is partitive; 'poured some of the sacrament of the cup into the child's mouth.' It is used also of the Passover; *sacramentum Paschae* 217. 8, 752. 20; and of means of grace generally, 770. 19. In 370. 19 *hunc si fieri potest, sequamur omnes, huius sacramento et signo censeamur*, it seems to mean the sign of the Cross; cf. 664. 25. In *Sent.* 7 (440. 19) it is equivalent to *Symbolum*.

[1] Cf. *forma facti* = τύποι γενόμενοι in the Vg. of 1 Pet. 5. 3, and *deformare* in this sense in Tert. *Res. Carn.* 30.

[2] This distinction seems the best explanation of *Christiani fideles*, which occurs seven times in the probably Cyprianic *De Spect.*, *fidelis* being the substantive and of *Christiana fidelis*, Tert. *Ux.* 2. 8, i. e. a baptized person

Christians are often called simply *nostri*, 301. 7, 522. 14, &c. *Homo Dei* occurs six times, 365. 12, &c., *homo Dei et Christi* 297. 13; *seruus Dei* is common. They are called *diuinum genus* 366. 22, and are contrasted with *genus humanum* 301. 15[1]. *Credentes* is very common, as is *fidentes* 510. 19, &c., probably invented by Cyprian as a stronger cognate term for the weak *fideles*; it does not appear to be used by Tertullian. *Creduli* is absent, though the negative is common[2].

§ 9. *Ecclesia*[3] is often paraphrased by *domus Dei*, e.g. 477. 4, 674. 24, or *domus fidei* 300. 19, 777. 20, &c. *Ecclesia quae catholica una est* 733. 9, and fairly often, e.g. 597. 13. Cyprian does not use the elliptic *Catholica*, sc. *ecclesia*, of Cornelius (611. 16). The epithet *sancta*[4], 767. 9, seems to have no variant, and is not very common. Cornelius writes (611. 8) *sanctissima catholica ecclesia*[5]. The Church is frequently said to be *aedificata* or *fundata super Petrum*. This occurs 194. 25, 212. 14 (the famous passage in *De Un.* 4), 338. 17, 403. 16,

worthy of the name of Christian; cf. A. 4. 17 *homo Christianus fidelis*, where both are epithets. In *De Rebapt.* 11 (A. 83. 5) *nihil interest utrum hic uerbum audiens an fidelis sit qui confitetur Dominum* the words simply mean unbaptized or baptized; cf. *fidei sacramentum* = Baptism in Tert. *De. An.* 1 (299. 22 Reiff.).

[1] *Quoadusque istic in mundo sumus cum genere humano carnis aequalitate coniungimur, spiritu separamur.* It would add point to Tacitus' *odium generis humani* if it were a recognized term by which the Christians distinguished the heathen from themselves; and might seem consistent with the charge of magic brought against them under the same name; cf. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 236. Yet in 393. 26, 404. 26, 409. 15 *genus humanum* is used inclusively; in 306. 12 *sine ullo discrimine generis humani* it seems to be used of heathen not being selected for punishment in this world.

[2] *Credulitas* = *fides* is not employed by Cyprian, but by Nemesianus, 834. 8, which seems the earliest instance. Cyprian has it in a bad sense 210. 4, 731. 7. It recurs in Arnobius and Jerome for *fides*. *Incredulus, incredulitas, infidelis* are common.

[3] The exact phrase *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, often attributed to Cyprian, does not occur in his writings. The nearest approach to it is 795. 3 *salus extra ecclesiam non est*, and 477. 5.

[4] Here may be noted the rarity of *sacer*: 688. 2 *cleri nostri sacer ueneranduque congestus* is almost the only instance; the word is avoided in an obvious antithesis 724. 12.

[5] *Catholicus* is not used so widely as in Tertullian; *catholica regula* 767. 3, *fides* 538. 20, *catholicae institutionis unitas* 604. 11, and a few more.

594. 6 [1], 674. 16, 732. 25, 769. 20, 773. 12, 783. 15. *Petra* is so used in *Ep.* 75 (820. 27, cf. 821. 16), but never by Cyprian. In 338. 17 Hartel has introduced it into the text on insufficient MS. authority, and in spite of Cyprian's constant use of *super Petrum.* For the description of faithful Christians as *super petram fundati*, see § 24. In connexion with the Church, Cyprian also often uses the words *matrix, radix, origo, caput*; e. g. 607. 9 *ut ecclesiae catholicae matricem et radicem agnoscerent ac tenerent*, 808. 2 *caput et origo*, 779. 19 *caput et radix*, 772. 23, &c. *ueritas et matrix* [2], 600. 2 *radix et mater.* How far *matrix* is equivalent to *mater* it is difficult to say; in 607. 9 the word was probably chosen for the rhyme; cf. 214. 14, 338. 15. *Ecclesia sponsa Christi* (*Test.* 2. 19 *tit.*) is carried out as a metaphor with great consistency, e. g. 804. 21 *apud solam sponsam Christi quae parere spiritaliter et generare filios Deo possit*, 243. 15 *ecclesiam matrem, patrem Deum*, and even more strongly 214. 17 ff. *Ecclesia mater* is of constant occurrence, 490. 5, 588. 13, &c. In 680. 23 *matris sinus* is opposed to *nouerca.* Heresy is *adulterium* 214. 17, 667. 2, &c. *Corrumpere, uiolare*, &c. were certainly used by Cyprian much more literally in this connexion than we, with our ways of thinking, should assume; cf. especially 593. 21. *Adunare* (usually the perfect participle) and *adunatio* are often used of the Church, 238. 10, 620. 3, 698. 21, &c. *Intus* and *foris* express membership and exclusion; *plebs intus posita* 687. 17, *foris esse* 745. 9; both together 732. 13 f. But the pleonastic *intus in ecclesia, foris extra ecclesiam* is much more common; 784. 20, 214. 25, &c. Except this last example, from *De Un.* 6, it is confined to the

[1] In this passage *una cathedra* is joined with *una ecclesia*; cf. 630. 2, 683. 10.

[2] The following list is, I think, a complete one of the passages in which one or more of these words occur in connexion with the Church; 188. 9, 212. 3, 213. 1, 214. 4, 14, 220. 24, 231. 11, 338. 15, 403. 26, 404. 2, 579. 9, 701. 22, 769. 20, 783. 14, 786. 23, in addition to those given above. In different contexts cf. 352. 15, 421. 4. In no instance can the use of *matrix* be that of *urbs primaria regionis alicuius* which Paucker in his *Addenda* gives from later writers. Tertullian makes a use of the word similar to Cyprian's, but wider.

Baptismal controversy, where it occurs at least fourteen times. *Foris seorsum* is used 672. 9, *foris positi et extra ecclesiam constituti* 778. 13; cf. 785. 17.

Ecclesia is of course used for the local as well as for the universal Church; *ecclesiae omnes* 627. 11, *ecclesia principalis* (Rome) 683. 10, &c., yet Cyprian does not often use the word in this sense.

The body of Christians is occasionally *secta*; 101. 8 *quaedam capitula* (of Scripture) *ad religiosam sectae nostrae disciplinam pertinentia*; 543. 8 *moderatus et cautus et humilitate ac timore sectae nostrae uerecundus*. In 397. 8 *uias quibus ad consequenda diuinitus praemia spei ac fidei nostrae secta dirigitur* there is a violent enallage (for many similar cf. Koziol, *Der Stil des L. Apuleius*, p. 223 f.). But this use of *secta* is much more common in Tertullian.

§ 10. Lay members of the Church are *laici* 632. 6, &c., but not very often; usually *plebs* or *populus*. Of these two *plebs* is the less common; *plebs cui praesumus* 656. 12, *ea plebs cui praepositus ordinatur* 739. 10; *stantium plebs* 526. 6, &c. *Plebs Domini*, *Christi* is an inclusive term for all Christians, 219. 6, 390. 5, &c. Once the plural occurs, 735. 9 *plebes consistentes ad Legionem et Asturicae*, of the lay members of the communities. *Populus*[1] *credentium*, *Christianorum*, *ecclesiae*, *noster* (211. 14, 363. 1, 414. 25, 730. 15, 732. 12, &c.) is very frequent. It also stands alone, e.g. 239. 16 *populi aliquando numerosi multiplex iactura*; cf. *Sent.* 33 (449. 1) *nec duobus populis salutarem aquam tribuere potest ille qui unius gregis pastor est*. *Populus*, but not *plebs*, is used of the heathen as well as of Christians, e.g. 390. 5, where *populus perditionis ac mortis* is opposed to *plebs Christi*, 711. 3, &c.

§ 11. The four terms, *episcopus*, *sacerdos*, *antistes*, *praepositus* are used for *Bishop*. The first three have only this one sense. *Episcopus* (*coepiscopus*, *pseudoepiscopus*, *episcopatus*) is not much

[1] Sittl, *Lokale Verschiedenheiten*, p. 108, is right in saying that *populi* in the vulgar sense is absent from Cyprian. In the sense of *multitudo* it occurs occasionally, 314. 1, 343. 6; 581. 4 *populus circumstans* = *circumstantes*.

more common than *sacerdos.* The latter (with *sacerdotium, consacerdos, sacerdotalis*), though no doubt it is often used because the name involved an argument and a claim, is employed so freely and so naturally that it must have been a current term of unmistakable import[1]. *Antistes* used, like

[1] In Cyprian's writings there is no passage where *sacerdos* must, and not many where it can, be equivalent to *presbyter.* The numerous cases where *episcopi et sacerdotes* occurs are simply pieces of Cyprianic rhetoric, like *preces et orationes, aduersarius et inimicus = diabolus,* and many more, cf. p. 230. In *Ep.* 1 (466. 16) the decree of *episcopi antecessores nostri* is called in 467. 4 *sacerdotum decretum.* In *Ep.* 15. 1 (514. 3) *sacerdos Dei* is contrasted with *presbyteri*; cf. 522. 4. The Church of Carthage has only one *sacerdos*; 581. 12 *ut Domini misericordia plebi suae sacerdotem reddat incolumem.* The bishop's seat is *cathedra sacerdotalis* 630. 2. Other passages where the same meaning is obvious are *Ep.* 3, throughout which *episcopus* and *sacerdos* are interchangeable, *Ep.* 55. 9, and *Ep.* 67. 2. There are, I think, only five passages where *presbyter* can be the meaning of *sacerdos*; (1) *singuli diuino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti,* which includes all the clergy: *diuino* makes it likely that presbyters are embraced in the sacerdotium; cf. the reference to 629. 9 in my note, p. 260. (2) 586. 6 f. the *presbyter* Numidicus was all but slain in the persecution, and survived against his will; *remansit inuitus, sed remanendi, ut uidemus, haec fuit causa ut eum clero nostro Dominus adiungeret et desolatam per lapsum quorundam presbyterorum nostrorum copiam gloriosis sacerdotibus adornaret. et promouebitur quidem* sq. This might mean that Carthage, which has lost presbyters, shall be provided with fresh ones; but it is much more probable that the sense is that the Church which has lost mere presbyters shall have the honour of a bishop being elected from among its clergy. This explains *et promouebitur quidem,* which the other translation does not. (3) 697. 1 *et cum episcopo presbyteri sacerdotali honore coniuncti*; here *honor* must not be pressed. *Licentia* or *potestas* is never attributed to presbyters. It refers to the outward respect paid to them as in *Test.* 3. 85, 465. 5, 585. 14, 689. 13. (4) 738. 20 *nec hoc in episcoporum tantum et sacerdotum sed et in diaconorum ordinationibus obseruasse apostolos animaduertimus.* Here again the words are identical. There is no such formal record in the Book of Acts of the ordination of presbyters as there is of that of St. Matthias and of the Seven. (5) 777. 1 *oportet enim sacerdotes et ministros qui altari et sacrificiis deseruiunt integros adque inmaculatos esse.* Here O. Ritschl, *Cyprian u. d. Verfassung d. Kirche,* p. 231, would translate *presbyters and deacons.* But in *Laps.* 6 (240. 16) *sacerdotes* and *ministeria* (or perhaps *ministri*) include the whole clergy, and may do so here. Cyprian is always a careless writer, and it would not be well to press this single instance. He is no doubt referring directly to presbyters and deacons (776. 15), but has used the other terms as an argument *a fortiori.* O. Ritschl, *l. c.,* cites Huther as denying that *sacerdos* in Cyprian means *presbyter.* In Tertullian, Kolberg, *Verfassung, &c. d. Kirche nach d. Schr. Tertullians,* p. 41, fails to give a clear instance of *sacerdos = presbyter*; yet the argument of the famous passage

sacerdos, of the Priests of the Old Testament (*Zacharias antistes Dei* 687. 5, *Z. sacerdos* 337. 5) is used frequently of bishops, and of no others; 254. 4 *antistites et sacerdotes* pleonastic, like *episcopi et sacerdotes*, and so Min. Fel. 9. 4. *Praepositus* normally means a bishop; 729. 20 *omnes praepositos qui apostolis uicaria ordinatione succedunt*, 218. 25, 765. 24, &c.; *praepositi et sacerdotes* pleonastic, 730. 8. In 470. 5 Aaron is *sacerdos praepositus*. But in 514. 18 *praepositi* are the clergy in the absence of the bishop, as in the Roman *Ep.* 8 (486. 6) *praepositi et uice pastorum* during the vacancy of the see. In 475. 15 *praepositi et diaconi* are synonyms; cf. Tert. *Fug.* 11, where *praepositi* is used inclusively for the whole *clerus*. *Pastor*, e.g. *Test.* I. 14 *tit.* and *gubernator*, e.g. 674. 1 are also frequently used, and of bishops only. In *Ep.* 66. 5 Cyprian describes himself by all these six titles, *episcopus*, *praepositus*, *pastor*, *gubernator*, *antistes*, *sacerdos* (730. 10). He uses *caput* in 600. 6; cf. 203. 6.

Bishops are *collegae* and form a *collegium*. There seems no reason to suppose that *antecessor* (466. 16, &c.) has any other sense in Cyprian than the temporal, cf. the common *successio*, though Koffmane, p. 58, suggests that it conveys the notion of authority as well, and is derived from the Jurists[1]. The latter may well be the case. *Locus*, *gradus*, and *cathedra*, all of frequent occurrence, are used of the bishop's position. His authority is usually described as *licentia* or *potestas*, words only used of bishops.

§ 12. *Presbyter* (*presbyterium*, both collective and of the

in *Exh. Cast.* 7 requires, or at least gains strength from, the identity in meaning of these terms. Ambrose in his *Epp.*, and the documents included in that collection, consistently use *sacerdos* = *episcopus*. Schepss in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 3. 323, notes the same of Priscillian; see also Miodoński's note to *De Aleatt.* p. 62, with his references. Jerome is the earliest writer to waver in the matter, often using *sacerdos* in both senses, as does Augustine, who states, *C. D.* 20. 10 (Dombart, ed. 2, ii. 433. 16) that the name belongs to both Orders. As late as Ps.-Ignatius, *Hero*, § 3, and Ps.-Pionius, *Vita Polyc.* § 21, ἱερεύς is used without qualification for 'bishop.' Cyprian constantly calls presbyters his *conpresbyteri*, never his *consacerdotes* or *collegae*. He does not use Tertullian's *summus sacerdos* for 'bishop.'

[1] Cf. Kolberg, *op. cit.* p. 38, n. 12.

office, *conpresbyter*) has no variant. In *Test.* 3. 76 *maiorem natu non temere accusandum* Cyprian is bound by his Biblical text (Vg. *presbyterum*). In *Ep.* 75 (814. 30) *maiores natu* is one among many strong evidences against Cyprian as the original translator, as is *seniores* in the same letter, 812. 22.

Diaconus (*diaconium*; for forms see p. 297) is also constant, though it is tempting in a few cases to regard *minister*, *administratio* as meaning 'deacon' and 'diaconate'[1]. For *dia-*

[1] Cf. Koffmane, pp. 25, 150. *Minister* and its cognates are often used, and in various senses, by Cyprian. In 590. 15 the clergy other than the bishop are classed as *presbyteri, diaconi, cetera ministeria*; 465. 11 *singuli diuino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti*, where *et* is disjunctive; cf. Tert. *Praescr.* 29 *tot sacerdotia, tot ministeria perperam functa*; *ministri ecclesiae* 571. 1 refers primarily to two subdeacons and an acolyte. In 240. 16 the term is inclusive, as also 466. 21. But 738. 25 *altaris ministerium* is 'the office of a deacon,' and the Levites, who are the counterpart to Cyprian of the deacon, are always *ministri* with a *ministerium*, 470. 3, 757. 1, &c.; 469. 10 *diaconus officii ac ministerii sui oblitus*. There is a clear example of *minister = clericus*, and probably *diaconus*, in *Ep.* 21 (Celerinus), 531. 12, where the true reading appears to be *et nunc super ipsos factum antistites Dei recognoui idem minister*, 'I, myself a *minister*, recognize you as raised above God's bishops.' By the common notion that orders were bestowed, *ipso facto*, on confessors, Celerinus in his modesty gives himself a lower and his friend a higher grade in the ministry; cf. Hermas, *Vis.* 3. 2, 1, Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* 1. 184 n., and the Roman *Ep.* 8 (488. 10), where the confessors precede the presbyters; also Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 3. 241. The evidence is stronger for *administratio = diaconatus*. In 2 Cor. 9. 12 διακονία is translated *administratio* in Cyprian's Bible (113. 20, 380. 23) instead of the Vulgate *ministerium*; 617. 1 *diaconio sanctae administrationis amisso* appears an identical genitive (cf. *preces orationis*, &c., and *apostolatus ducatus* in *De Aleatt.* 1); 590. 14 *diaconi ecclesiasticae administrationi deuoti*. But the word is used of Aaron's office 411. 10, and therefore also of bishops, 489. 3 *integritas administrationis*, 828. 19, &c., as is *administrare*; *sacerdotium Dei administrare* 735. 17, 770. 15, *Sent.* 1 (437. 5); cf. 510. 15, 608. 6. Both *administratio* and *ministerium* are used of the lower orders of the ministry in the twin passages, 581. 22, 588. 2. In 629. 9 *Cornelius . . . per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus et in diuinis administrationibus Dominum saepe promeritus* implies, I think, that Cornelius had been a presbyter, for except in this one passage *diuinus* (which probably refers to the Eucharist) is confined to *sacerdotium*, *ecclesiasticus* being the only epithet given to the diaconate and lower grades. Tertullian in *Exh. Cast.* 10 seems to use *minister* of the celebrant at the altar. It is remarkable how little, no doubt intentionally, Cyprian refers to the presbyterate; cf. his avoidance of the word *sacerdos* in relation to it. In another sense *ministerium* occurs 548. 1 *scio . . . paucos* (*clericos*) *qui illic sunt uix ad m. cotidianum operis sufficere*, and 502. 12.

conium see p. 299, and cf. Koffmane, p. 25. *Diaconatus* does not occur.

Hypodiaconus is always used for the African subdeacon, not only by Cyprian, but by others, as in *Epp.* 77, 78, 79. It is also used in 572. 12 in a Roman letter, but of a Carthaginian officer. The only case of *subdiaconus* is in the Roman *Ep.* 8 (485. 20); a Carthaginian is spoken of, and this seems the earliest use of the word. No Roman subdeacon is named.

Lector, *lectio* have no variant; *lectionem dare alicui* 548. 6. *Acoluthus* also is invariable, as is *exorcista*, though Cyprian rejects the verb *exorcizare*. *Proximi clero* 548. 5 suggests the *proximi* of the Roman civil service[1]. Cyprian mentions all orders of the ministry except the deaconess and the *ostiarius*.

For *religio*, *religiosus* in the sense of orders, clerical, see the note to § 24. *Clerus* as a collective noun is very common, e.g. 466. 10, 689. 13; as an abstract[2] it is absent. *Clericus* is common as a substantive, naturally for the most part in the plural; as an adjective it is rare, *cl. ministerium* 465. 11, *ordinatio* 466. 10, *epistula* 489. 18, &c. The collective *ordo* (e.g. 808. 17) is very rare, though common in Tertullian.

The words normally employed by Cyprian to describe the appointment of clergy are *constituere*, *ordinare*, *facere*. All are used of all ranks, e.g. a bishop *electus et constitutus* 608. 8; *Sent.* 78 *non olim sum episcopus constitutus*; of a lector 584. 21. *Ordinare*, *ordinatio* are the most common, e.g. *delectus diuina ordinatione episcopus* 696. 26; cf. Hartel's *Index Rerum*; it is used of a deacon 738. 21, of a lector 581. 5. *Facere* is not so common; 593. 8, 597. 12, &c. *Deferre episcopatum*

Nemesianus in *Ep.* 77 (835. 18) actually uses the word for concrete alms; *m. quod distribuendum misisti.* The work of the apostles is *ministerium salutis* in 755. 19. In *De Rebapt.* 5 (A 75. 31) *integritas ministerii* = validity of the ministerial act, i. e. Baptism. Hartel need not have doubted the text.

[1] *Proximi memoriae, a memoria*, &c., holding a position between that of a procurator and of his subalterns. Cf. Hirschfeld, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 211, 215, 265, &c.

[2] In such senses as *De Rebapt.* 1 (A. 70. 26) *nullum in quocunque clero constitutum*; yet cf. 741. 9.

alicui occurs 739. 17; *cooptare* 678. 9 and *creare* 642. 22 are only used of heretical bishops. *Eligere* and *deligere* both occur several times. The voice of the laity is always *suffragium* 629. 24, 738, 15. *Manum inponere in episcopatum* 739. 17 and 610. 4 (Cornelius). Deposition from orders is twice described by *deponere*, 472. 6 and 739. 23. Usually he contents himself with the wider term *abstinere*, or such general expressions as *excitare de presbyterio*, *separare se a peccatore praeposito*, *indignos recusare* (619. 9, 737. 22, 738. 2), &c.

§ 13. Councils of different kinds are frequently mentioned, but Cyprian appears to avoid anything like technical language concerning their assembly or proceedings. Usually he describes their meeting as *in unum conuenire* 627. 14, 779. 2, or *praesentes adesse* 465. 5, 581. 5; *concilium habere* occurs 628. 6, 677. 20; *concilium agere* 680. 10[1]; *cogere et celebrare concilium* 775. 5. *Conuentus* occurs 600. 22; cf. the *conuenticulum* of heresy 220. 23, &c. It does not come within the scope of this paper to deal with the constitution of these Councils, for there is no distinction in Cyprian's language as to their meeting, their proceedings or their decisions, except that in 465. 4, *ego et collegae mei qui praesentes aderant et conpresbyteri nostri qui nobis adsidebant*, some distinction might seem to be made as to the status of the different Orders. But in 771. 6 *quid nuper in concilio plurimi coepiscopi cum conpresbyteris qui aderant censuerimus*, there seems to be no difference. For the debates of the Council Cyprian has a great wealth of language; *communicato et librato de omnium conlatione consilio* 626. 13, *librata consilii communis examinatione* 717. 16, *ponderare*, *examinare*, *pondus examinare*, *limare*, *tractare*[2], &c. The de-

[1] *Concilio frequenter acto.* This must mean frequently assembled, and not largely attended, as the Archbishop of Canterbury would have it in his article *Cyprian* in the *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* *Frequenter* is Cyprian's usual word for often; he only uses *saepe* for purposes of rhythm, and perhaps not more than twelve times in the whole of his writings. Did *frequenter* mean anything but 'often' in the third century?

[2] Of debates or modes of procedure during the session there is no account. In 627. 16 we read that at a Council of bishops *scripturis diu ex utraque parte*

cision of the council is *decernere*, *statuere* (*statuere et firmare* 774. 14), *indicare* or *censere*, all of frequent occurrence. The substantives used for the decisions are *sententia*, *decretum*, *placitum*, and once (466. 22) *forma*.

The assembly of the clergy at other times than at a council is *consessus* 586. 15, no doubt of the bishop and presbyters only, and *congestus* (unless this be, as is more probable, the dais on which they sat) 688. 2. So also 585. 2 *sessuri nobiscum* is a promise that a lector shall be advanced to the presbyterate. In 689. 13 *clerus tecum praesidens* includes the whole clergy, and refers to function rather than to dignity.

§ 14. The first stage towards Christianity is named *uenire*. Cyprian, with his dislike of Greek words, never used *proselytus*, though it occurs in Tertullian. In the letters of the Baptismal controversy *uenire*, *ueniens*, *ad Christum*, *ad ecclesiam*, &c. are constant. Occasionally he ventures on *ueniens* alone; 769. 18 *uenientem baptizare*. *Catecumenus* occurs twice, 106. 18, 795. 16 (i.e. in *Test.* and Baptismal *Epp.*, in which no attention is paid to style), and in the Roman *Ep.* 8 (488 2), *catechista* never, *catechizare* only in *Ep.* 75 (823. 17). *Audiens* is twice used for *catecumenus*, 524. 14, 548. 8[1], *doctor* for *catechista*; *presbyteri doctores* are mentioned 548. 6, and a *doctor*[2] *audientium* ib. 8, the latter being a lector; *doctor* without further description 780. 20. *Nouus*, *nouellus*, *rudis* seem merely descriptive epithets, and not substitutes for the absent *neophytus*, which has been deliberately avoided.

§ 15. Often as Cyprian has to speak about Baptism, he has no such wealth of synonyms as other writers. He does not

prolatis temperamentum salubri moderatione librauimus, which must mean a compromise. The use of Scripture suggests that in 523. 4 *ut . . . conuocatis coepiscopis secundum Domini disciplinam . . . martyrum litteras examinare possimus*, *disciplina* may mean 'Scripture,' as in certain other passages; cf. § 6.

[1] Cf. *uerbum audiens* in *De Rebapt.* 11, 14 (A 82. 31, 83. 5, 87. 10) = *catecumenus*. Cf. Kolberg, *op. cit.* p. 63.

[2] So Hartel in his *Ind. Rer. s. v. doctores*, though in his text he reads *doctorum*, and in the *Ind. Verb. doctores audientes*. It seems impossible to make sense if the traditional reading *doctorem* be abandoned.

go far beyond Biblical language. It is impossible to make a distinction of meaning between *baptismus* and *baptisma*. For forms see p. 297. *Tinguere*, *tinctio* are confined to heretical Baptism, except in two passages, 543. 12, 782. 5, where Cyprian is indirectly citing Scripture[1]. The only use of *inluminare* = φωτίζειν in this sense seems to be 789. 12 *quomodo possunt tenebrae inluminare?* where the context suggests Baptism, though it may be only a general expression; cf. *Sent.* 22 (445. 10). *Abluere* occurs occasionally; 752. 6 *baptizandi adque abluendi hominis potestatem*; ib. 3 *ablui et purgari eius lauacro*; 219. 21. This no doubt is from 1 Cor. 6. 11 in Cyprian's Bible (168. 3, 275. 11) as well as the Vulgate. In all other instances it has an object in Cyprian, *crimen*, *sordes* or similar words[2]. Christians are *recreati et renati* 294. 11, 365. 21, *reparati* 400. 27, &c., *expiati* 6. 4, 8. 5, 751. 16, *innouati* 204. 6, 769. 7, 803. 1; *reformatus in nouum hominem* occurs 803. 8, *redintegrare* 279. 15. *Purificare* 786. 24, &c. is rare; cf. 578. 26. *Regeneratio*, *sanctificatio*, *renasci* are common property of Christian writers. Baptism is *natiuitas secunda* 6. 6 and often, *iterata* 204. 7, *caelestis* 427. 28, &c. Other similar epithets are also used; cf. Koffmane, p. 78. It is *lauacrum salutare* 204. 6, &c., *uitale* 188. 14; *aqua uitalis*, *salutaris* 374. 8, 752. 5; in the rhetorical language of the *Ad Donatum*, 6. 3 *unda genitalis*. *Fons* in 785. 21, &c. is purely metaphorical[3]. For the use of *sacramentum* see the note to § 7, p. 253. Those who are duly baptized

[1] This contumelious use of a word which had been normal in the previous generation (Tertullian and the African Bible) must be an indirect attack on Montanism, to which Cyprian never alludes, though it undoubtedly existed in Carthage in his day. *Intinguere*, which also occurs in Tertullian, is used several times in the *Sententiae*, and *tinctio* survived till the sixth century. Paucker, *Subrelicta*, cites it both from Fulg. Rusp. and Fulg. Ferr. In other respects there is little difference between the language of Cyprian and Tertullian concerning Baptism and the Eucharist.

[2] See Wölfflin in his *Archiv*, 4. 569. His earliest instances of *abluere* = *baptizare* are Tert. *adu. Marc.* 1. 14, Iren. 4. 27. 1.

[3] Yet Koffmane, p. 76, sees in it an allusion to a concrete sense of *fons* in Baptism.

become *legitimi Christiani* 760. 16; cf. *legitimi fideles* in *De Rebapt.* 14 (A 87. 12). The gift in Baptism is *gratia*[1], 719. 15, 760. 15, 273. 6, &c. The Baptismal questions are *interrogatio*[2], 756. 10, &c. *Symbolum*, 756. 7, according to Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* I. 103 n., is the earliest use of the word.

Vestigium infantis for *pes*, 719. 13, in the ceremonial kissing of the foot which formed part of the Baptismal rite, is no doubt part of Cyprian's attempt to elevate Christian diction. It appears not to be Biblical. The word attained some currency. In the twenty-third sermon attributed to Fulgentius Ruspensis, *De pedibus lauandis*, it is constantly used of the feet.

Concerning *unctio* and *signum crucis* (*signaculum dominicum* 785. 5, *consignari* 751. 6, *signari* 783. 10, *signum et sacramentum* 370. 19, *signum Dei* 664. 25) nothing need be said. *Chrisma* occurs only 768. 14, and is there explained by *unctio*. *Manus inpositio*, after Baptism and penitence and in Ordination, is constant, though the simple *manus* occurs once at least (248. 22). That it is a single word, as Hartel suggests in his *Index Verborum*, seems clear, in spite of one or two rhetorical postpositions of *manus*[3].

§ 16. The word *Eucharistia* is not very common. It is

[1] *Gratia* is less used by Cyprian than might have been expected. Besides this use for the gift in Baptism, which is much the most common, it is used for other gifts or favours, e. g. 293. 7 *aduentus Christi aeternae gratiam lucis praebiturus*, 365. 17 *gratia omnis et copia regni caelestis*, 380. 18 *beatus Paulus dominicae inspirationis gratia plenus*. It seems actually to mean 'reward' in several passages, e.g. 202. 18 *uirgines quarum ad gratiam merces secunda est*, 204. 3, 311. 1, 421. 14, &c. *Gratia Dei = bonitas* occurs occasionally, 272. 13, 275. 20, &c.; *gratia et indulgentia* together, 432. 14; 425. 10 *homo ad Dei gratiam pertinens* is a Cyprianic abstraction for *ad Deum*. The word is not often used in a general sense of 'spiritual power bestowed'; yet cf. 260. 12, 320. 20. In connexion with the Eucharist I have only noted the strange use, 256. 14 *gratia salutaris in cinerem mutatur = hostia*; cf. *ministerium = stips* 835. 18.

[2] Beside the question *Credis in remissionem* sq. which recurs so often, there are traces of the Baptismal formula in 406. 3, 508. 13, and in 192. 20, 281. 4, which contain the word *pompae*, used by Cyprian only in this connexion.

[3] On which Koffmane, p. 78, lays stress. But the double genitive required in *manus inpositio episcopi*, which constantly occurs, is almost unknown in Cyprian's writings. I have only noted 262. 11, 665. 3.

absent, for instance, from *Ep.* 63, which is entirely devoted to the subject. Its sense is concrete; communicants are said *eucharistiam accipere, Test.* 3. 94 *tit.*, 280. 20, &c., and conversely, 519. 4 *ab episcopo . . . eucharistia datur*; 280. 11 *eucharistiam ad cibum cottidie sumimus; eucharistiam contingere, adtingere*, ib. 10, 19; cf. 407, 24. The word is used as a synonym for *potus sanctificatus* 255. 20. In 768. 19 is an obscurely expressed passage where *eucharistiam facere* stands for the usual *sacrificium celebrare*, as also in *Sent.* 1. *Sanctum Domini* occurs 248. 5, 256. 7, 10; 217. 12 the pleonastic *caro Christi et sanctum Domini.* This may be an ellipse for *sanctum Domini corpus* 514. 12; *corpus Domini* occurs alone 665. 3, &c. Once also, as already mentioned in the note on *gratia* to the last section, *gratia salutaris* is used in relation to *sanctum Domini*, 256. 14 *quando gratia salutaris in cinerem sancto fugiente mutetur*, where *sancto* must either stand for *Christo* or be a neuter abstract [1]. The usual title for the Eucharistic, service is *sacrificium*, either alone as in 256. 9, 697. 23, or more often *s. diuinum* or *dominicum.* The elliptic *dominicum* occurs 384. 20, 714. 13, 14, the last instance being plural. *Hostia dominica* is opposed to *falsa sacrificia* 226. 9, and must be equivalent to *sacrificium*; cf. *uictima* for σφαγή in the O. L. of Is. 53. 7 [2]. *Sollemnia* is used for the Eucharistic service, 255. 14 *sollemnibus adimpletis*, and 649. 26; in the latter passage also *sollemnitas* [3]. In 713. 22 the whole service seems to be called *oblatio.* For the use of *sacramentum* in connexion with the Eucharist, see note to § 7. The most remarkable example is *sacramentum crucis* 431. 17. *Celebrare* is the most usual verb with *sacrificium, Test.* 1. 16. *tit.*, 256. 9, 466. 19, &c.; 830. 16

[1] *Fug.* 25 (25. 18 Reiff.) *ex ore, quo Amen in sanctum protuleris* seems to be the only similar case in Tertullian. Can it mean to say the response after the *Ter sanctus?*

[2] Rönsch, *Itala u. Vulgata*, p. 327, and Cyprian 80. 8, 414. 11, 507. 7. Perhaps also in 402. 21 *cum ad uictimam Christi confundantur sidera* is the true reading.

[3] Joh. 13. 1 in Tert. *Prax.* 23 has *sollemnitas Paschae* (Vulg. *dies festus*). *Sollemnia* and *sollemnitas* are constantly used by Tertullian of Christian and heathen rites.

facultas offerendi et celebrandi sacrificia diuina[1]. *Sacrificare* occurs 255. 10, but was no doubt avoided through its painful suggestion of the lapsed *sacrificati*. *Sanctificare calicem*, &c., e.g. 255. 21, 701. 17; *sacrificium dominicum legitima sanctificatione celebrare* 708. 10. Beside the use of *offerre sacrificia* already named, 736. 23, 830. 16, it is employed absolutely 479. 15 *offerre apud confessores*, and with *pro* of persons either dead or living (for the latter see § 26) 465. 19, 514. 12. 583. 11. *Oblationem facere pro dormitione* 467. 2 is equivalent to *sacrificium celebrare pro dormitione* 466. 19. *Offerre oblationes eorum* occurs 568. 14; *calix qui offertur*, sc. *Deo* 702. 9; *celebrare oblationes et sacrificia* 503. 21, cf. the use above mentioned of *oblatio* 713. 22. The Eucharist is a *commemoratio* both of Christ 702. 9, cf. 713. 13, and of the martyrs 503. 14, 504. 1, 583. 12. It will be seen that the name of a part of the Eucharistic service is often put for the whole; cf. especially 713. 21 *sic enim incipit et a passione Christi in persecutionibus fraternitas retardari dum in oblationibus discit de sanguine eius et cruore confundi*, i. e. from fear of being detected through the smell of wine[2].

Some of these terms are used of the worshippers as well as

[1] *Celebrare* is a favourite verb of Cyprian's. Besides this use of *celebrare sacrificia* = *sacrificare*, used also of heathen sacrifice, 673. 16, there are also *celebrare orationes* = *orare* 274. 7, 292. 4; *celebrare diuinas lectiones* 580. 24; *lauacra cottidie* = *lauari* 259. 6; *tot martyria iustorum saepe celebrata* = *perpetrata* 337. 8; *benedictionem celebrare circa Abraham* = *benedicere* 704. 7; (*patrimonium*) *unde opus caeleste celebratur*, i. e. charity, 380. 11; *acies adhuc geritur et agon cottidie celebratur* 526. 15, and similarly 389. 20 *quale munus est cuius editio celebratur* = *quod editur*; *sic spiritalibus meritis et caelestibus praemiis temporum uicissitudo celebratur* = the confessors pass their time, 578. 5. In this vague sense the word is very common in the more rhetorical parts of Cyprian's writings. Compare *De Rebapt.* 2 (A. 71. 21) *notissima omnibus praedicatio celebrata atque coepta a Iohanne Baptista*. *Celebrare resurrectionem Domini* occurs 292. 25, 714. 20 = commemorate, and so 583. 12 *martyrum dies anniuersaria commemoratione*, and 503. 15. In 193. 12 a passage of Scripture is introduced by *scriptum est ... et in exemplum nostri ecclesiae ore celebratur* = is proclaimed; 763. 13 *cuius aequalitatis sacramentum* (type) *uidemus in Exodo esse celebratum*. *Cogere et celebrare concilium* 775. 5.

[2] Cf. Hieron. *Ep.* 114. 2 *sacrosque calices et sancta uelamina et cetera quae ad cultum dominicae pertinent passionis*.

of the celebrant. *Sacrificium* in 384. 22 is used of their offering; they are called *sacrificantes* 255. 27, though this is rendered uncertain by comparison with l. 10; cf. 269. 2 *quando in unum cum fratribus conuenimus et sacrificia diuina cum Dei sacerdote celebramus.*

Altare is constant in Cyprian of the Christian altar. In 688. 2, 722. 4 he contrasts heathen *arae* with *Dei altare*; cf. 360. 4. Once a heathen altar is called *diaboli altare* 679. 23 (so Tert. *De Pallio* 4 *altaria bustuaria*), but he never speaks of *ara Dei*[1]; in his most violent attacks upon schism he always speaks of *altaria profana*, never of *arae*. *Nidor altarium*, of heathen worship, 24. 14, is one of many strong evidences that *Quod Id.* is not by Cyprian.

Communicatio[2], and sometimes the full form *ius communicationis* is common; *communicationem tribuere* 249. 9, *ius communicationis accipere* 518. 20, *laxare* 247. 28, &c. The verb *communicare* is equally common; *cum aliquo* 467. 18, 732. 6, &c., being used of the recipient, *alicui* of the celebrant, 568. 13, 632. 9, &c. But there are a few exceptions, as 519. 21, 624. 8,

[1] Yet in the O. L. *ara* was certainly frequent, perhaps constant, in a good sense. In *Apoc.* 6. 9 Cyprian reads it three times, 130. 14, 250. 8, 413. 7. In this verse Tertullian has twice (*Res. Carn.* 25, *De An.* 9) turned it into *sub altari*, but he is paraphrasing the passage. Elsewhere he uses the words indifferently; cf. Kolberg, p. 212 f. Primasius retains *ara*. It occurs in this sense in *Clarom.* in Heb. 7. 13, and in *ff.* in Jac. 2. 21. In the Vulgate it is only found in the Apocryphal books, which were not revised by Jerome. Arnobius uses the words indifferently, and often in combination, of the heathen altar; Lactantius, I think, does the same. Ammianus, 22. 11. 9, uses *ara* of the Christian altar, perhaps in insult. In the Index to the first part of *C. I. L.* viii. (the African volume) *ara* occurs thirty-five times of the heathen altar, *altare* only once. The Christian altar is not named. The second part of *C. I. L.* viii. is unindexed, but in reading it through I did not notice anything inconsistent with the view that in ordinary language the words were thoroughly differentiated. In Virgil, *Ecl.* 5. 65 *en quattuor aras, Ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo*, the word *altare* seems more dignified than *ara*. It is certainly also rare in Augustan prose. Being stately and uncommon it was well adapted to the Christian need.

[2] *Communio* is rare, and only used in general senses, as 789. 11 *nullam communionem lumini et tenebris* 758. 4, 10, &c. Cf. the curious use, 545. 15 *cum martyribus in honore communis est = particeps.* Yet in the Roman *Ep.* 8 (487. 20) *communio = communicatio*, and also in *Ep.* 75 (825. 18).

800. 2, where *communicare cum aliquo* is used of the celebrant. The verb is used absolutely, in the sense of *communicationem accipere* 588. 18, 740. 17; similarly *non communicantes* for *abstenti* 262. 1[1]. It may be mentioned here that the *Sursum corda* is entitled a *praefatio*, 289. 15.

§ 17. Prayer is usually *prex* or *oratio*. When the word stands alone, *prex*, not *preces*, is almost constant; in the compounds favoured by Cyprian *prex* seldom occurs. *Preces et orationes* in pleonasm is common, 272. 10, 465. 12, 578. 25, 596. 1 (twice), 688. 22; *prex et oratio* 267. 18, 276. 10; *petitiones et preces* 287. 6; *preces orationis* 500. 15; *postulationum preces* 319. 12. *Petitio* is fairly common; *precatio*, 268. 3, is rare. The most common verb is *rogare*; *orare* is also frequent, as is *petere*; *precari* and *postulare* (five times in *Dom. Or.*) not so common. *Deprecari* is used for *orare* 275. 3, 287. 10, 288. 15, 841. 16, as well as in its usual sense; cf. Thielmann in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 1892, p. 253. Elaborate phrases, such as 501. 7 *oratione communi et concordi prece orantes*, are of course numerous. *Adorare*, *adorator* (e.g. 267. 20, from Joh. 4. 23) are confined to indirect citations from Scripture. The Lord's Prayer is *prex cottidiana*, as in Aug. *C. D.* 21. 27 (Dombart, ed. 2, ii. 548. 30).

For thanksgiving the language is not remarkable, except in the use of *uotum*, e.g. 504. 18 *quid enim uel maius in uotis meis potest esse uel melius quam cum uideo confessionis uestrae honore inluminatum gregem Christi?* i.e. 'for what can I be more thankful?' It is often practically equivalent to, and used with, *gaudium*; 728. 13 *uenientes . . . cum uoto et gaudio suscipio*, 614. 11 *uoti communis amplissimum gaudium excepimus*, 641. 11 (*filium*) *cum uoto paternae exultationis amplectitur*, 510. 22, 619. 12, &c.; so in other writers 557. 17, 620. 8, and Quint. 12. 5. 6[2].

[1] In a badly worded phrase of Stephanus, cited 799. 18, 814. 8, he seems to use *communicare aliquem* for *alicui*. Cyprian takes evident pleasure in pointing out that his opponent's diction is on a level with his arguments; *quae inperite atque inprouide scripsit* 799. 14.

[2] *Votum* is also often used in the classical sense of desire, e.g. 308. 23

There is not much that is noteworthy concerning watching, literal or metaphorical, and fasting. *In frequentanda oratione nocte uigilare* 288. 22, *inuigilare et incumbere ad preces* 289. 11, *uigilare in satisfactione Dei* 522. 17, and the like are frequent. *Ieiunium*, 377. 13, &c. is common.

§ 18. *Ecclesia*, as the body of Christians,—*ecclesia id est plebs in ecclesia constituta* 711. 18—has already been considered. In *Test.* 3. 46 *tit. mulierem in ecclesia tacere debere* he is borrowing Scriptural language; but 508. 20 *ad ecclesiam reuerti* may mean the place of assembly. This is more probable in 686. 3, where Cyprian speaks of Felicissimus and his companions as not having the courage *ad ecclesiae limen accedere.* But there are no instances so clear as some in Tertullian of this sense of the word. *Statio* is used 598. 9, and also by Cornelius, 612. 7. The only furniture of the Church mentioned beside the altar is the *pulpitum*, from which the lector read the Scripture. The *pulpitum* in 583. 24 is *tribunal ecclesiae*, and the lector *loci altioris celsitate subnixus.* In 581. 1 the exchange by the confessor Aurelius of the *catasta* for the *pulpitum*, on his ordination to the lectorship, gains the more in point the greater the resemblance between the two. In *Pass. Perp.* 19 Saturninus is exposed upon a *pulpitum* at his martyrdom. In *Pass. Perp.* 5, 6 the prisoners' station in court is *catasta*, rendered in the Greek by *βῆμα*. Rutilius Namatianus (1. 393) in the fifth century describes Christian sermons as *mendacis deliramenta catastae.* Thus it had come to be equivalent to pulpit. The two words must have been identical in meaning; a platform affording a full view of the person reading, on sale (Pers. 6. 77, &c.), or under trial or torture.

It is remarkable that Cyprian seems to avoid giving a definite name to the Christian meeting. He is contented with vague language, like *colligi* 222. 4 (cf. 659. 15; never the vulgar *colligere* of Tertullian and others; Koffmane, p. 47,

maiora desideria et uota potiora, 351. 15 *studio magis contradicendi quam uoto discendi*, 510. 1, 656. 7, 686. 17, &c.

Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 353), where, however, *extra ecclesiam* may be local; *in unum conuenire* 269. 1. Perhaps, indeed, there was no permanent church in Carthage. A comparison of 600. 22 *considentibus Dei sacerdotibus et altari posito* at a Council, with 688. 1 *recedentibus sacerdotibus ac Domini altare remouentibus*, suggests that the place of meeting was not permanently devoted to its purpose. Had there been a church the Council would no doubt have met there. But the *cleri nostri sacer uenerandusque congestus* of the latter passage was in all probability a dais, and must have been cumbrous for removal. There is no such use of the word in Georges' Dictionary, and it may possibly, as already suggested, be equivalent to *consessus*, but cf. Apul. *De Deo Socr.* 4 (p. 9. 14 Goldbacher), *usque ad regni nutabilem suggestum et pendulum tribunal euectus.* And when in 688. 1 we read *ut ecclesia Capitolio cedat* it seems as though each were a building, and each perhaps single of its kind.

§ 19. Beside the acts of worship already mentioned there remains the sermon of the bishop. No one else is named by Cyprian as addressing the people. In 527. 20 he speaks of *adlocutio et persuasio.* This was by letter, but Cyprian's letters addressed to the people were really speeches, some of them of the most rhetorical character, written to be delivered for him in the assembly. Though *adlocutio* was a recognized term (Tert., Novatian in *Ep.* 30 and later writers; see Matzinger on *De Bono Pud.* p. 14) Cyprian never uses it again. Instead he constantly uses *tractatus*; *tractatio* never. *Tractare*, in the sense of preaching, occurs in the Preface to the *Testimonia*, 36. 3, where Cyprian states that his object in writing is *non tam tractasse quam tractantibus materiam praebuisse.* He repeats this, as he usually does with what seem to him happy phrases, in the Preface to the *Ad Fortunatum*, 318. 11 *ut non tam tractatum meum uidear tibi misisse quam materiam tractantibus praebuisse.* As *tractantes* in the second clause of both certainly means preachers, the word must have the same meaning in the first. The verb recurs in the same sense 633. 17, 659. 15, 842. 1, the noun 219. 3, 383. 7, and in

Ep. 77 by Nemesianus, 834. 7 *non desinis in tractatibus tuis sacramenta occulta nudare*[1].

§ 20. There is not much variety in the mode of address by the clergy to one another and to the laity. *Frater* is normal in both cases, the laity are *fratres et sorores* 473. 8, cf. the common *fraternitas*; *lector frater noster* 565. 14. In directly addressing his correspondents the word rarely stands alone; in the hostile *Ep.* 66 to Florentius always, and also often in the friendly *Ep.* 59 to Cornelius. Elsewhere in that letter the usual *frater carissime* is used. A bishop is called *filius* in 469. 4, and Quirinus of the *Testimonia*, addressed as *fili carissime*, may have been a bishop also, and certainly belonged to the clergy, as the *Magnus filius* of *Ep.* 74, and others so styled by Cyprian may also have done. The only epithets used, except the neutral *desiderantissimus* of the final salutations, are *carissimus* and *dilectissimus*. Of these the former is used for the most part in addressing clergy, the latter in addressing laity, though there are sundry exceptions[2]. *Dilectissimus* is constantly employed in *Ep.* 58, to the *plebs* of Thibaris, in which the Bishop and Clergy of that place, who must have been at variance with Cyprian, are ignored. It is also usual in the treatises, e.g. *de Un.*, *B. Pat.*, *Dom. Or.* *Carissimus* is used more irregularly. Its common use is to the clergy, clergy jointly with laity, or the confessors. Yet in *Ep.* 43, addressed to the *plebs* only, they are *carissimi* four times, *dilectissimi* thrice. But bishops also are called *dilectissimi*, e.g. 435. 11, 806. 15, and in *Ep.* 67, addressed to clergy

[1] From *De Bono Pud.* 1 (A. 13. 5) *cotidianis euangeliorum tractatibus* the sermon seems to have been part of the daily Eucharistic service, cf. ib. 14. 1. Matzinger, *Des hl. Cypr. Tractat de B. Pud.*, Nürnberg, 1892, has shown strong grounds for regarding this treatise as Cyprian's; cf. p. 194. Cyprian uses the noun twice (623. 14, 632. 3), the verb four times (510. 3, 525. 7, 565. 19, 570. 7) of proceedings in Council, where the speeches no doubt had some resemblance to sermons. *Tractatus* appears to be used several times in the *De Rebapt.* in the sense of argument. *Praeconium* (add to Hartel's list 237. 14, 363. 9) is never used in this sense by Cyprian, as Koffmane, p. 97, asserts.

[2] See Wölfflin's most instructive article in his *Archiv*, 1892, p. 19. Nothing can be learned from the recent papers of Babl and Engelbrecht on this subject.

as well as laity, *dilectissimus* is constant, except in the final salutation, where *carissimi* stands; but the genuineness of this salutation is doubtful.

Dominus is never used by Cyprian. He is so addressed by other bishops, 836. 3, and the word is used several times in the *Epp.* by persons of different classes to their equals and superiors, much as it is in Apul. *Metam.* *Papa*, *Papas* is confined to Novatian and other Roman writers in their addresses to Cyprian. Cornelius never uses it. *Benedictus* (used in the Rom. *Ep.* 8, 485. 19, *Pass.* *Perp.* 3, Tert. *Praescr.* 30, &c.) is never used by Cyprian either of the living or of the dead. *Beatus* is constantly used for confessors and martyrs; *beatissimus* more rarely, both of the living and dead, e. g. 492. 15, 828. 13.

In addressing others Cyprian often speaks modestly of *mediocritas nostra* (101. 15, 297. 11, 317. 8, 435. 12, 527. 15, 22, 576. 18, 623. 20, 749. 5, 760. 19, 799. 1; *parua nostra mediocritas* 765. 22), for *ego*, an expression apparently first used by Velleius, 2, 111. 3. Elsewhere he uses the word as an abstract in similar passages; e. g. 4. 7, 568. 6, 656. 10, 702. 1, 798. 9. Other examples of self-depreciation are 189. 19 *extremi et minimi et humilitatis nostrae admodum conscii*, 309. 16 *minimus et extremus*, 500. 8 *minimus famulus*. The two last are justified by being used of himself as favoured with a vision. There is no formal system of abstraction, *sanctitas tua*, &c. in Cyprian (cf. Wölfflin in his *Archiv*, 1892, p. 3), yet there is a certain approximation to it; e.g. 495. 13 *admoneo religiosam sollicitudinem uestram*, 588. 3 *diligentia uestra*, 504. 15, 676. 13, 775. 7, &c.

It is worthy of notice that Christians in Cyprian's *Epp.* invariably have only one name, in spite of the obvious inconvenience of this in a country so ill-provided as Africa. The only exceptions are in *Ep.* 66, where Cyprian follows the example of his opponent Puppianus in giving himself two names, coupled, in the manner usual in the African inscriptions, by *qui et*[1], and the two Geminii of *Ep.* 1. The same is

[1] E. g. in the unindexed supplement to *C. I. L.* 8, 12499, 14513, 14936,

the case in the very numerous monumental inscriptions found in the ruins of the great church of Carthage.

§ 21. The payment of the clergy by the laity is rarely mentioned by Cyprian. In 724. 4 he mentions *stipes, oblationes, lucra*; the second is used again, 838. 12, in a passage which shows that it does not necessarily mean Eucharistic oblations. In three other passages he gives what are evidently definite technical terms; 466. 12 *in honore sportulantium fratrum tamquam decimas ex fructibus accipientes ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant*, 571. 1 *interea se a diuisione mensurna tantum contineant*, 585. 1 *ut et sportulis idem cum presbyteris honorentur et diuisiones mensurnas aequatis quantitatibus partiantur.* There are thus three sources of income: (1) the *stips*, which is the *stips menstrua* of the Church in its organization as a guild, and forms the *diuisio mensurna*[1]. This must also be the *stipendia ecclesiae episcopo dispensante* of 588. 14. (2) *Oblationes*, which can only have been an irregular source of income. (3) *Sportula* and *honor*, with *sportulare* and *honorare*. *Honor*, *honorare* must have a definite sense, like the *honor medici*[2], and *sportula* must have the same sense as in the guilds, where periodical distributions were made to the members from the interest of legacies, gifts of the rich, or a general subscription; cf. Schiess *op. cit.* p. 103. The *sportulae* differed in amount according to the rank of the members in the society; cf. Tert. *Ieiun.* 17 (297. 2 Reiff.). Thus in 585. 1 the ordained confessors are to have the same *sportula* as the presbyters; i. e. probably less than the deacons received. Cyprian says nothing about the days chosen instead of the heathen festivals, imperial birthdays, &c., on which the *sportulae* were distributed in ordinary guilds. It is curious,

16608, and once (cf. Hoffmann, *Index Grammaticus ad Africae titulos*, p. 112) *Caecilia Festiua qui et Leda*, 16919.

[1] Cf. Schiess, *Die röm. Collegia Funeraticia*, p. 75. The contributions must have been heavy, since they had to provide stipends, as well as to meet the usual expenses of a burial club.

[2] Perhaps *Relatio Symmachi*, § 15 *cum religionum ministros honor publicus pasceret* has the same meaning. Symmachus is pleading against the abolition of the endowments of the temples.

though probably nothing more, that under the Empire there should have grown up a system of *sportulae* for the maintenance of the Roman worship: cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii. 63.

§ 22. Of Christian virtues the one most commonly inculcated is *disciplina*. Of *disciplina* one sense, in which it represents διδασκαλία, has already been mentioned in § 6. It stands more often for loyalty or obedience to the law of God, and of conduct resulting from such obedience, e.g. 268. 18 *precatio cum disciplina quietem continens et pudorem*, where *cum disciplina* is adverbial, 269. 3 *uerecundiae et disciplinae memores*, both of the conduct of worshippers; 429. 15 *ad patrem Deum deifica disciplina respondeat*, 618. 22 *nec remanere in ecclesia Dei possunt qui deificam et ecclesiasticam disciplinam nec actus sui conuersatione nec morum pace tenuerunt*[1]; 584. 16, *ut magisterium caeteris praebeat disciplinae*, 742. 21, 527. 7[2], &c. It is not always easy to distinguish cases in which the thought is that of military discipline from those in which it is of religious teaching. Practically identical with *disciplina*, in its sense of 'loyal obedience,' are sometimes *censura* (see note to § 3) and often *uigor*, though it is more often used of the bishop in his capacity of judge than of other Christians, loyal under pressure[3]. *Integer*, *integritas*, also in the sense of 'loyalty,' are common.

[1] In these two passages *deifica disciplina* is simply equivalent to *disciplina dominica* 505. 21. See § 1.

[2] *Disciplina* is often used with, or in the same sense as, *censura*, e.g. 666. 12 *litteras . . . et ecclesiasticae disciplinae et sacerdotalis censurae plenas*, 625. 14, &c. In 592. 24 *disciplina* is contrasted with *misericordia*. Closely connected with its use of the teaching of Scripture is that of *disciplina euangelica*, the law of the Gospel, 592. 19, 709. 23, 713. 18, &c. It stands for a lesson learnt, 303. 16 *hanc apostoli disciplinam de Domini lege tenuerunt non mussitare in aduersis*, 802. 12; of proficiency in what has been taught, 9. 5 *disciplina est ut perimere quis possit*. The contrast between the *disciplina* of public and the *conuersatio* of private life, which Kolberg (p. 164 n.) traces in Tertullian, cannot be established for Cyprian In other respects the two use the word in the same senses and with equal frequency.

[3] *Vigor* has a wide and vague use. It is most common as equivalent to *censura*, in the sense named above; 199. 17, 730. 20, &c. *Censura uigoris* 744. 16, and *censurae uigor* 284. 14, are identical pleonastic terms. It is also used for 'severity,' 326. 4, 608. 11, &c.; cf. in the Roman *Ep.* 36 *uigor tuus et*

Caritas and *dilectio* (once, in *Test.* 3. 3 *tit. agape et dilectio*) are equally common. *Adfectio* seems only once (232. 1) to be used of the virtue; elsewhere it is of personal feeling. *Concordia* (*concordia pacis* 217. 23, 220. 17 and *concordiae pax* 285. 11). *Pax* (*pax morum* 618. 23, cf. 621. 17; the adjectives corresponding to it are *pacatus* once, 221. 5 *simplices et pacati*, *pacificus* constantly[1]), *quies*, *uerecundia*, *continentia* in the patristic sense, and *humilitas*[2] are constantly mentioned. The right feeling of man towards God is usually *timor*, e.g. 526. 7 (*timere* 302. 27, and often, *timidus* 501. 10, *timide ac religiose* 716. 7), more rarely *metus* 392. 26, &c., with *metuere* 737. 21, &c. *Trementes ac metuentes Deum* occurs 567. 10; *humilem et quietum et trementem sermones suos* 506. 2. *Obsequium* and *obseruatio* are very common, 392. 29, 741. 23, &c. *Deuotio* is not very common; 631. 5 *deuotio et timor*; 660. 9 *deuotionis fides* equivalent to *fidelis deuotio* 786. 10; *deuote et fortiter* 513. 9, *deuota uirtus* 663. 23, &c., *fidelissimus ac deuotissimus frater* 503. 16. The meaning is always that of loyalty. *Dicatus Deo* (see Hartel's *Index*), according to Bünemann on Lact. *Epit.* 71. 8, first occurs in Cyprian. *Iustus* is fairly common as equivalent to 'righteous,' e.g. 681. 4 *confessores et uirgines et iustos quosque fidei laude praecipuos*; so also *iustitia*, 431. 7, includes all the virtues previously

. . . *seueritas* (572. 18), and 551. 16, also Roman. It means also the right to jurisdiction, 469. 13 *pro episcopatus uigore et cathedrae auctoritate*, 667. 14, &c. In all these cases it is exactly equal to *disciplina*. It is also often used quite classically for 'power' or 'energy'; 6. 18, 361. 6, 725. 10, &c. *Vigor fidei* is very common, 339. 25, 630. 24, &c.; *uigor continentiae* 638. 16. *Vigor, disciplina, censura, robur, tenor* (*tenorem tenere* 621. 17, 725. 9, *tenore custoditae fidei uigere* 828. 17, *si tenor fidei praeualet apud uos* 806. 15, &c.) are all used separately and in combination without any definite difference of meaning.

[1] *Pax* is also frequently contrasted with *turbo, tempestas, procella* of persecution or heresy.

[2] *Humilis, humilitas* are almost always used in the Christian sense; cf. 507. 16 *humiles et quieti et taciturni* (unmurmuring), and in the Roman *Ep.* 31 (563. 1) *humilitas et subiectio.* In 730. 24 the *humilitas* of brigands to their chief; in 189. 19, 689. 4 it means 'lowly position.' *Humiliare* (373. 7) is rare, except in Scriptural reminiscences.

mentioned. Similar uses are 7. 1, 223. 20, 623. 10[1]. *Fides*, as the Christian Faith and in relation to Baptism, has been already mentioned. As a virtue of the individual Christian it is also used in the Scriptural way: e.g. 672. 17 *fides qua uiuimus*. There seems to be nothing peculiar about the manner of its employment. The uses of *credere* are sufficiently given in Hartel's *Index*[2].

§ 23. Charity and alms are often described as *eleemosynae*. The singular perhaps only occurs in *Test*. 3. 1 (III. 12) *nemini negandam eleemosynam* and 377. 10. The plural seems always to mean 'acts of mercy,' *eleemosynas facere* being the most common use 379. 23, &c., from Acts 10. 2, &c.; cf. 290. 21; there is nothing like *eleemosynas dare*. *Misericordia*, according to Koffmane, p. 30, was first introduced by Cyprian as a translation of *eleemosyna*[3]. In *Test*. 3. 1 *tit. de bono operis et misericordiae* becomes in § 2 *tit. in opere et eleemosynis*. These are, as is usual in Cyprian, simple pleonasms. *Misericordia* is very common in *Op. El.*, e.g. 374. 22 *addidit eleemosynas esse faciendas; misericors monet misericordiam fieri*, which are identical phrases; 375. 18 *misericordiae opera*; 376. 17 *operationibus iustis Deo satisfieri, misericordiae meritis peccata purgari*, and many more. *Miserationes pauperum* = 'acts of mercy to the poor,' occurs 379. 24, from Dan. 4. 24 (377. 6). But the common word for acts of charity is *operatio*, often with the epithet *iusta* (see note to the last §) as in 374. 9, 384. 11, but also without, 382. 27, 503. 18, &c.[4] *Opus* in the

[1] The word is often also used in the sense of 'adequate'; *paenitentia plena et iusta* 636. 14, *datur opera ne satisfactionibus et lamentationibus iustis delicta redimantur* 680. 21, &c. It is difficult to see the exact meaning in 651. 18 *obtemperandum est ostensionibus adque admonitionibus iustis*; in the Roman *Ep*. 31 (561. 22) *de tuis laboribus iustis* is from the LXX of *Prov*. 3. 9. For *iustitia* as a rendering of the Biblical δικαιοσύνη in the sense of 'alms' see the next section, and J. B. Mayor's valuable note on Jac. 5. 20 on the theological use of δικαιοσύνη.

[2] For *credere Christo*, &c. add 362. 26, 404. 2, 422. 18, 596. 10, 729. 16; for *credere aliquem*, *Sent*. 14 and A. 72. 11; *credere contra aliquem* 734. 10.

[3] Yet Tert. *Adu. Marc*. 4. 37 has *misericordiae opera*, and cf. *Fug*. 13 *in*.

[4] In other senses the word is rare; 7. 1 *operatio iusta* seems used generally of a righteous life; 466. 8 *Leuitica tribus . . . qui operationibus diuinis insistebant*.

singular is not very common in this sense, *Test.* 3. 1, 2, 26 *tit.*, 385. 10, &c., though the plural constantly occurs. *Opera* singular is absent, and the plural *operae* is only used by the illiterate Celerinus, 531. 4. *Operari* is also common, e.g. *Test.* 3. 40 *tit. non iactanter nec tumultuose operandum. Operans* occurs as an adjective 394. 3, and 407. 1 *iusti et operantes*, and also *operarius* 379. 17, *o. et fructuosus* 380. 3[1]. The last, with its contrary *sterilis*, is often used. *Iustitia* is often used for 'charity.' The word is no doubt derived from δικαιοσύνη, regarded as an exact equivalent for ἐλεημοσύνη, in such Biblical passages as Matt. 6. 1. There is no rendering of this verse in Cyprian, but the Vulgate has *iustitiam*, and probably Cyprian had the same, though *k* reads *elemosinam*. At any rate there are many other Biblical passages from which he might have borrowed the word; cf. Meyer's *Commentary* on *Matt.* 6. 1. The word is thoroughly adopted and used freely and naturally by Cyprian; *iustitiae opera* 314. 5, *iustitiae ac misericordiae nostrae opera* 392. 19, and *iusta operatio* often in *Op. El.*; *iusti et operantes*, synonymous, 407. 1; cf. 307. 5. As has been already stated, *pius, pietas* are not used by Cyprian in this sense. 'To distribute alms' is commonly *dispensare* 393. 12, 588. 14, 700. 19, &c.[2]

§ 24. The distinctively Christian *conuersatio*, for 'manner of life,' is not much more common than *actus*. Their strict meanings seem to be reversed in 739. 13 *episcopus deligatur plebe praesente quae . . . uniuscuiusque actum de eius conuersatione perspexit*, where *actus* must mean 'character' and *conuersatio* 'conduct.' Elsewhere the words seem to be used

[1] *Opus, operari* occur in several senses; *opera saecularia, funesta* 633. 6, 636. 3, &c. In 837. 20 Nemesianus strangely writes *sacrificium ex omni opere mundo. Operari in aliquem* = 'to relieve,' 386. 8, 'to injure,' 483. 8; *operari ad bonos usus, necessitates*, &c., 195. 23, 479. 4, 700. 28; *circa fructum salutis operantes* = 'to win,' 390. 2; *magis ac magis intellectus cordis operabitur scrutanti scripturas* 36. 18; *operatur per inprobas mentes uirus* 12. 3; *clauo funibus uelis ut fabricetur et armetur nauis operare* 647. 1. The verb is transitive in 11. 6.

[2] *Expungere* in the very hastily written *Ep.* 41 (587. 13, 588. 5) cannot be regarded as an ecclesiastical term.

indifferently. *Conuersari* is very rare in this sense; e.g. 274. 13 and in *Ep.* 75 (817. 21).

Religio has a wide use, though such phrases as *religio christiana* do not occur[1]. It is often employed of the religious frame of mind as in 204. 19 *iustitiam cum religione retinentes, stabiles in fide* sq., which, in Cyprian's language, is probably equivalent to *religiose*, 303. 2 *circa timorem Dei stabilis et firmus et ad omnem tolerantiam passionis fide religionis armatus*, 742. 9 *permanet apud plurimos sincera mens et religio integra*, 743. 17 f. *integritatis et fidei uestrae religiosam sollicitudinem laudamus et adhortamur ne . . . sed integram et sinceram fidei uestrae firmitatem religioso timore seruetis*, *Test.* 3. 3 *tit. agapem et dilectionem religiose et firmiter exercendam* 193. 28, 250. 17, &c. It will be seen that the word is used in passages where there is the notion of steadiness and of awe. The preceding passages have referred to the laity only or to all Christians; but the word is also specially used of the debates and decisions of Bishops and Councils, as 466. 16 *episcopi antecessores nostri religiose considerantes et salubriter providentes*, 716. 7 *sollicite et timide ac religiose*, ib. 25 *religioni nostrae congruit et timori et ipsi loco adque officio sacerdotii nostri*, 736. 20, 805. 9, &c. The connotation of *inreligiosus* is the same, 415. 12 *inreligiosa et inuerecunda festinatio*, 741. 12 *nec uos moueat . . . si apud quosdam aut lubrica fides nutat aut Dei timor inreligiosus uacillat*[2].

[1] Yet cf. 741. 25 *Iudaeis deficientibus et a religione diuina recedentibus*, 369. 24 *uerae religionis candida lux* contrasted with *tenebrosa superstitio*.

[2] Beside this general use of *religio* it appears to have definitely that of 'Orders' in two passages; 586. 10 *et promouebitur quidem* (*Numidicus presbyter*) *ad ampliorem gradum religionis suae*, i.e. *sacerdotium*, 629. 11 (*Cornelius*) *per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus . . . ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit.* So also 510. 15 *administratio religiosa* stands for the usual *ecclesiastica*. But in 478. 14, though a similar passage, *religio* has quite a general sense, as also probably in 600. 22 *in tanto fratrum religiosoque conuentu*, i.e. *tam religioso* (cf. 609. 2 *tanta laetitia adfecti sumus et Deo . . . gratias agimus*, sc. *tantas*. Such omissions of a particle through the same preceding are common in Cyprian; see p. 198 n.). The word comes to mean rule, 465. 18 *cuius ordinationis et religionis formam Leuitae prius in lege tenuerunt*, where there are three synonyms; in 686. 18,

Christians are thrice described as *fundati super petram* 210. 16, 579. 9, 625. 4; cf. 188. 10. *Christus qui est petra* occurs 706. 19[1]. Progress in Christian life is expressed by *proficere*, which is constantly used in all possible constructions[2]. The result is *promereri Deum*, used by Cyprian at least twenty-three times[3]; *merita* means almost as often 'punishment' as 'reward,' 359. 8, 496. 19, &c. The metaphor of *agon*, *palma*, &c. is used of a good life as well as of confessorship, 394. 21 ff., and elsewhere.

§ 25. Sin[4] is *peccatum* or *delictum*, the former being the more usual. *Peccator*, both as a substantive and as an attribute (*sacerdos sacrilegus et peccator* 769. 2, &c.), is common; *delictor* only occurs 720. 17. *Delinquere*[5] is somewhat

713. 18 it seems equivalent to *disciplina* and *censura*. In one passage, 698. 20 f., it seems used of a bond, according to the old etymology; *et non tantum dilectio sed et religio instigare nos debeat ad fratrum corpora redimenda.* Here *religio* refers to the *adunatio*, *dilectio* to *fratres* preceding. There remain the three passages 467. 4 *sacerdotum decretum religiose et necessarie factum*, 605. 13 *et religiosum uobis et necessarium existimaui . . . ad confessores litteras facere*, 701. 19 *religiosum pariter ac necessarium duxi de hoc ad uos litteras facere.* The third of these shows that in the second *uobis* cannot be construed with *litteras facere*; and Cyprian never has *litteras facere alicui*. *Vobis* must be equivalent to *erga uos* and *religiosum*, *religiose* taken in a general sense in all three cases.

[1] The word *petra* is used literally once, 667. 24.

[2] Hartel's list of these constructions is by no means complete. The word is very sparingly used by Tertullian; it is constantly used by Seneca of moral progress, and very possibly is a part of Cyprian's debt to him.

[3] To Hartel's instances add 392. 28, 483. 11, 494. 19, 511. 5, 525. 11, 539. 7, 629. 10, 831. 8, *Vita*, c. 3. All have *Deum* or *Dominum* as direct object, except 494. 19 *coronam de eo promerendam.* The word is not used by the other writers in Cyprian's *Epp.*, and rarely by Tertullian. It is used twice at least by Seneca instead of his usual *demereri*; *Dial.* 7. 24. 1, *Ben.* 2. 2. 1. Apuleius uses it thrice in *Met.* 5. 25, 6. 10, 11. 6 (93. 23, 103. 8, 209. 6 Eyss.). The first and third have *Cupidinem*, *numen* as objects. The word did not hold its own in later theological literature; Ambr. *Ep.* 63. 112, Hier. *Ep.* 120. 10, Aug. *C. D.* 19. 16, 21. 27 are, I think, the only instances in those writings.

[4] Much of the language dealt with in this section, though generally applicable, is used by Cyprian only in relation to heresy or lapse, because he rarely has occasion to mention other sins. For the sake of convenience I have dealt with the whole here, instead of placing part in the later sections which deal with those subjects.

[5] *Delinquere magna* 262. 18 (cf. *peccare grauia* 228. 1), *delinquere in Deum* 717. 10, *delinquentes* = *delictores* 743. 4.

rare; *peccare* occurs on almost every page. *Mortale crimen* only occurs once, 407. 21[1], *mortalia docere* 469. 3, i.e. the art of acting. Heresy is *falsa et mortalis seductio* 725. 16, and lapse *summum delictum* 518. 2. *Vulnus*, especially in *Op. El.*, is very common for 'sin'[2]. The metaphor is carried out with great consistency; *uulnerati, sauciati, medella, cicatricem obducere, mortuus*, &c. are frequent; cf. 635. 17 ff. Almost as common is the metaphor of disease, *morbus, morbidus* (always, I think, active, as it is in Lucretius' description of the plague, 6. 957, &c.), *contagium*, &c. The Biblical *transgredi* and *transgressio*[3] do not occur in the plain sense of 'sin.' The only other common metaphor is that of *labes* 428. 10, &c., *sordes* 374. 17, &c. (singular, *Test.* 3. 54 *tit.*). There is nothing noteworthy about the names of particular sins; *zelus* with *zelare* (in *Z. L.* and elsewhere, as 693. 24) is common; *moechus* 638. 11, &c., is rare.

The duty of man in relation to sin is *paenitere*[4], or *paenitentiam agere. Plangere delicta* 261. 10, &c. (also intransitive 641. 17, 649. 12), and many similar words are used in this connexion. It may be said that much of the language which is used of Baptism as taking away sin, and most of that which is used of Christ's work, is repeated of human effort; cf. such passages as 375. 2, 646. 12. The result of righteousness is *redimere delicta* 195. 24, 387. 16, &c., *tergere peccata* once, 387. 25, *propitiari Deum* 376. 16 (cf. 366. 1), *placare Dominum* 249. 25. *Deponere* (641. 8, &c.), and *exponere* (e.g. 423. 26) *peccata* are used occasionally. Beside *paenitentia* the normal language concerning penitents includes *deprecatio, satisfactio* and *exhomologesis*; 227. 10 *in paenitentia criminis*

[1] *Adulterium, fraus, homicidium* are the crimes so defined. Cp. p. 299 n., and Harnack, *De Aleatt.* pp. 27, 84 ff.

[2] Cf. Miodoński's note to *De Aleatt.* p. 83.

[3] *Vulnera transgressionis* is used by Novatian 551. 21; *transgressio praecepti* occurs 409. 17, *loci sui ministerium transgressi* 757. 2, *transgressor legis* 404. 27. These are the only instances of the word in relation to sin: it never has the absolute meaning of *peccatum*, &c.

[4] As a personal verb it occurs 526. 16, 647. 13, the first followed by a genitive, the second alone.

constituti Deum plenis satisfactionibus deprecantur. Deprecatio, singular and plural, is common, 377. 14, &c., *satisfactio, satisfactiones, satisfacere, satisfieri* constantly occur; 247. 9, 472. 14, 516. 11, 522. 17, 680. 18, &c. *Exhomologesis* is the regular word for 'confession'; it occurs in the plural 524. 5[1]. *Confessio* is only used twice in this sense; 258. 18 where it is explained by *confiteantur* preceding, and 615. 13 in the sense of return from schism[2]. *Exhomologesin facere* is not so common as *confiteri*, or *confiteri peccata.* Cyprian's favourite metaphor for such penitent conduct is *pulsare ad ecclesiam* 682. 18, &c.[3] The reward of penitence and confession is *manus inpositio* 514. 11, &c. It is strange, however, though in all probability an accident, that the substantive is never used in this connexion; there is always a periphrasis; *manu eis a uobis in paenitentiam inposita* 525. 18, and the like. *Remissa*, &c. have already been treated of under the head of Baptism. *Absolutio* and its cognates (cf. Tert. *Adu. Marc.* 1. 28) are entirely absent.

The punishment of the impenitents (*contumaces* 248. 16, &c. is common, but hardly precise) is *abstineri*; *abstinere* transitive occurs, 475. 20, &c., ten times in all, *abstentus* also frequently[4]. The full form *abstinere a communicatione*, 590. 4, is not often used. *Cohibere a communicatione*, 597. 15, and *prohibere*, 280. 13, do not recur. The opposite to *abstinere* is *admittere* 636. 7, &c., or *pacem dare, concedere*, &c., e.g. 717. 15.

[1] The evidence is strongly in favour of *exhomologesis* instead of Hartel's *exhomologesin*; cf. the plural *haeresis* 781. 16, 800. 1, &c., which is the true reading, not *haereses.*

[2] Probably also 647. 12, though there it may have its usual sense. It was very natural that Cyprian should avoid it, since he has so much occasion to speak of confession in the other sense. But it is almost as rare in Tertullian; perhaps only *Adu. Marc.* ii. 24 *paenitentiae confessio, Apol.* 24, *Paen.* 3, 8, *Carn. Xti* 8.

[3] It is impossible to reconstruct from Cyprian the ceremony of penitence and readmission. But from *Ep.* 59. 15 it is clear that the account given by Tertullian in *Pud.* 13, though hostile, is not inaccurate. Tertullian's language in relation to sin, penitence, &c., is much the same as Cyprian's.

[4] For the construction of *abstinere* see Weinhold in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 6. 509 ff.

§ 26. Human responsibility is recognized as *arbitrium liberum*[1]; *Test.* 3. 52 *tit.*, 204. 1, 218. 16, 674. 15; cf. the common saving clause concerning bishops, e. g. 778. 5 *quando habeat in ecclesiae administratione uoluntatis suae arbitrium liberum unusquisque praepositus.* Man's mind and conscience is usually *conscientia*; the word has a wide extension of meaning[2].

§ 27. Human life is transitory (for *consistens* implying this see p. 311), and its end a summons or departure. *Mors, mori* are therefore usually paraphrased, and not often used of Christians without some qualification.

There is a great variety of language concerning death. *Arcessire, arcessitio*, from the Old Latin of such passages as Joh. 14. 3 (v. Rönsch, *It. V.* 284, and Wölfflin in his *Archiv*, 1893, p. 286), occur respectively twice and five times[3]. The

[1] So in Tertullian, *Adu. Marc.* ii. 5 *liberum et sui arbitrii et suae potestatis inuenio hominem a Deo institutum*, and elsewhere.

[2] In the sense of 'mind,' e.g. 832. 24 *conscientiae uictricis uigor*, 494. 14 *uoluntas integra et conscientia gloriosa*, 258. 12 *hoc eo proficit ut sit minor culpa, non ut innocens conscientia*, 253. 13, 387. 17, &c. So also *conscientia* is often contrasted with *manus*, mental action with bodily; 256. 24 *manus contaminare, conscientiam miscere*, 634. 5 *manus pura, conscientia polluta*, 528. 2, &c. *Ne quid conscientiam uestram lateret* 547. 12, and similar phrases are very common; 500. 17, 777. 24, &c. Hence the word comes to have the exact meaning of 'knowledge'; 346. 8 (*Paulus*) *qui id quod et didicit et uidit maioris conscientiae ueritate profitetur*, i. e. truth gained by fuller knowledge; of knowledge involving consent, 717. 14 *sine petitu et conscientia plebis*, 727. 4 *sine conscientia et permissu Dei*, cf. 738. 13, &c. This knowledge may be that possessed by others of a person's character; 619. 8 *hanc conscientiam criminum iam pridem timebat*, i. e. public knowledge; so 398. 20 *uirtutum conscientia* is contrasted with *iactantia*; the good character of Christians is well known, though they do not parade it as do the philosophers; so also 10. 26 and probably 631. 11 *qui conscientiae suae luce clarescunt. Conscientia sua* seems to mean the general knowledge of Cornelius' merit, not his own conscious innocence. The word also means the sense of innocence or of guilt, more often the latter than the former; so 11. 4, 591. 14, 618. 21, 727. 22. In 634. 10 *tolerabilis conscientia* = a not unbearable sense of sin. Hence the meaning of actual innocence or guilt; 347. 17 *in persecutione militia, in pace conscientia coronatur*, 734. 17, &c.; 256. 5 *inpunitum diu non fuit . . . dissimulatae conscientiae crimen*, 283. 17 *admonemur quod peccatores sumus . . . ut conscientiae suae animus recordetur*, 474. 11, 739. 19, &c. *Bene sibi conscius* occurs 260. 5, 549. 4; *male sibi conscius* 678. 8, 683. 7.

[3] The verb in 308. 15, 730. 14 in addition to Hartel's instance from *Ep.* 22 (Lucianus).

Scriptural *dormire* is fairly common; *dormitio* is only used for peace after death, 466. 19, 467. 2. But usually words are chosen which simply convey the thought of departure; *abscedere* 636. 12, *decedere* 654. 3, *excedere* 304. 13, 466. 17, and often, and *recedere* 309. 20, &c., are all used absolutely[1]; *excedere a* or *de mundo*, *istinc*, &c. is also common; *de mundo recedentes* occurs 319. 9. *Exire* 730. 14 *exire de saeculo*, &c., 300. 21, 26, 308. 18, &c.[2]; *perire*, of a Christian's death, perhaps only 307. 11; *transire ad immortalitatem* 503. 21. *Proficisci ad Dominum* 731. 21, cf. 339. 6, *transgredi ad immortalitatem* 310. 22, seem not to be repeated. The corresponding nouns are *excessus* and *exitus*, with and without *de saeculo*, &c. Of these the latter is the more common, though *excedere* is much more frequent than *exire*. *Transitus* and *transgressus* stand together, 310. 24, 25 (cf. 192. 21 *transgressus* of the entry upon a new life in Baptism); *profectio* 833. 6, *profectio et translatio* 311. 14, borrowed from the Biblical *transferri* used of Enoch, *ib.* 16, 20; *redditio* occurs 394. 26[3]. The curious *excidium*, which has almost a literature to itself, is used 312. 22; see p. 299. To die before another is *praecedere* 695. 6, 828. 7, *ante se mittere* 585. 16, *praemittere* 586. 6: cf. 282. 13. *Resurgere* is used of man in the Scriptural manner; *corpore redeunte* 16. 3. Concerning burial there is no noteworthy language; *cimiterium* is used of a Roman place of burial, 840. 9, cf. *Acta*, § 1 (cxi. 9); in 740. 20 *apud profana sepulcra depositos* is the language of a letter from Spain, not that of Cyprian.

The dead are commemorated at the altar; the *oblatio* is made for them, including the martyrs, and the Sacrifice

[1] So *cedere* in the Roman *Ep.* 8 (486. 18); *recedente spiritu* 559. 6, also Roman; *recessit* absolute on a tomb, *C. I. L.* 8. 2010, for *obiit*. There is a valuable collection of terms for death, Christian and heathen, in A. Kübler's article on the Latinity of African Inscriptions in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 8. 183, which shows that these forms of speech were by no means exclusively Christian. I have found this article a valuable supplement to my own reading of *C. I. L.* 8.

[2] *Exire* occurs in *Pass. Perp.* 11 (twice) and 13 in this sense; it seems to be absent in Tertullian.

[3] Cf. *redditio episcopi urbici* in the heading given by most MSS. to *Ep.* 9.

offered, 466. 19, 467. 2, 503. 14, 583. 10. At the altar the name of the deceased is pronounced 466. 20; the *anniuersaria commemoratio* of martyrs in 583. 12 no doubt took the same form. *Deprecatio* on behalf of the deceased is also mentioned 467. 3, but it is not clear whether this is distinct from the naming at the altar; the *aut* need not be disjunctive. But *frequentetur* would appear to indicate that there was, for a Christian who died a natural death, one funeral celebration of the Eucharist, and afterward for some time a mention of his name in the usual service. *Deprecatio* is not spoken of in the case of the martyrs.

The true life is *uita*; 370. 4 *hic uita aut amittitur aut tenetur*, 288. 1, 526. 5, and often. *Vitalis* in the sense of 'life-giving' is also frequent; *aqua uitalis* 188. 14, 219. 20, &c., *remedia* 254. 9, *praecepta* 189. 24, *fontes* 786. 12, &c.; so also *uiuere*, *Deo uiuere*, *in Deo uiuere* 187. 4, 283. 11, 370. 2, 753. 5, &c.; *uiuidus cultus* = *aeternus* 16. 1; *uiuentes episcopi* 726. 4. *Viuificare* in the senses both of 'giving life,' as 370. 17, and 'restoring to life,' as 275. 17, is common; *uiuificatio* 394. 9, &c. *Caelum* is varied once, at least, by the Biblical *caeli* 658. 27, and by *caelestia*, also Biblical, 204. 4. Neither of these is in a Scriptural context. *Regnum caelorum* is common, and *regnum* also without definition, e.g. 432. 15; see Hartel's *Index Verborum*: *regna caelorum* 394. 10; *superna*, at least four times, 362. 19, 392. 27, 428. 19, 579. 2[1]. *Paradisus* occurs 390. 10, 829. 19, and in a few other passages. *Refrigerium*, also Biblical, is used occasionally, e.g. 829. 26; but Cyprian never employs Tertullian's *refrigerare*. *Consummare*, *consummatio* are frequent, 379. 5, 489. 3, &c.; *Consummator* (sc. *Christus*) only 242. 6.

§ 28. It remains to speak of the enemies of the Church, *diabolus*, *saeculum*, *haeretici*, &c. *Diabolus*, of course, is common, but Cyprian, with his usual dislike of Greek words, more often paraphrases the name. *Aduersarius* is the most

[1] *Superna*, I think, occurs only once in Tert.; *Scorp.* 10 (167. 8 Reiff.). His words for heaven are the same as Cyprian's, but *paradisus* is much more common.

common substitute; 289. 18, 580. 7, &c., *Inimicus* somewhat less frequent, e.g. 211. 9; *Aduersarius et Inimicus*, together by pleonasm, 667. 20; *Aduersarius uetus et hostis antiquus* 317. 20. Both are used as actual substantives, and with attributes; *expugnator Inimicus* 201. 18; cf. 249. 10, &c. *Malus* = ὁ πονηρός is used 286. 6, 287. 13, &c., but less often than by Tertullian. *Malignus* is not used by Cyprian. It has been already mentioned that he never has *Satan* or *Satanas*. *Immundus spiritus* (cf. *Pass. Perp.* 21) is opposed to *Spiritus Sanctus* 645. 12, and is elsewhere used for *diabolus*, but more commonly is in the plural. *Serpens* occurs several times, 210. 1, 373. 15, &c., but *draco* is absent. Cyprian is apparently the inventor of the adjective *serpentinus* 431. 15, 806. 9. Evil spirits are *immundi spiritus* often, *immundi et erratici spiritus* 7. 16 (cf. *spiritu erroris abreptus* 211. 2), *spiritus nequam* 765. 1 and in *Ep.* 75 (817. 10), *peccatores et apostatae angeli* 197. 26. *Daemonia* seems to occur only 645. 11, *daemon* not at all[1]. For the ejection of these spirits Cyprian never uses *exorcizare*; he leaves it to the speakers in the *Sententiae*, though he is obliged to use the recognized *exorcista*. He gives instead rhetorical descriptions of the exorcist's work, *flagellare*, *urere*, *torquere*[2], &c., without any word for the actual command to depart. *Adiurare* occurs only once, 361. 18, and in *Quod Id.* 25. 3. Diabolical action is described with much variety, *conflictatio*, *infestatio*, *incursatio*, *laqueus*, *labes*, *uenenum*, *funus*, *adulator*, *ueterator*, *praeuaricator*, *feralis*, *funestus*, *letalis*, *circumuenire*, *grassari*, *deicere*, *auertere*, *euertere*, &c. *Inferi* is the normal name for hell, 362. 19, 636. 8, 647. 12, &c.; *gehenna* occurs several times, the only Hebrew word used by Cyprian which he could have avoided, e.g. 483. 8, 689. 9. But he prefers

[1] In *Quod Id.* both are found, 23. 15, 16 and 24. 4; *daemon* also in *Ep.* 75 (817. 8), and *daemoniacus* in *Sent.* 1 (436. 16). Tertullian uses *daemon* and *daemonium* indifferently, but avoids the forms *daemoniorum* and *daemonibus*. I have only noticed these four times and once respectively.

[2] Cf. *C. I. L.* 8. 2756 *carminibus defixa iacuit . . . ut eius spiritus ui extorqueretur quam naturae redderetur.* Here *extorquere* must stand for *eicere*. It is a heathen monument to a wife. The conduct of the demon is described in language very like that in which Cyprian speaks of the exorcist, e.g. 361. 18, 764. 15.

to paraphrase; *poenalis flamma* 665. 8, *ardens semper gehenna et uiuacibus flammis uorax poena* 368. 16 [1], &c. He does not use *tartarus*, though it is employed by Tertullian and by Novatian in *Ep.* 30 (555. 19).

§ 29. *Saeculum* is the usual word for the world, in the theological sense, as translating κόσμος, but there are a number of exceptions, where *mundus* appears; 363. 22, 365. 21, 397. 16, &c.; *saeculum et mundus* pleonastic 250. 1, 312. 4. If Haussleiter [2] is right in making *saeculum* in this sense distinctively African, Cyprian's use of *mundus* may be derived from the Baptismal formula, which no doubt was used exactly as it had been brought from Italy; 406. 3 *qui diabolo et mundo renuntiauimus* appears to be a clear allusion to it. *Terra* is used once only in this sense, 501. 5; cf. the argument of *Dom. Or.* § 17. The adjective *saecularis* constantly occurs, with *saeculariter* (103. 22, &c.); *terrenus* also often, *terrestris* at least twice, 7. 7, 244. 22, and cf. 411. 8; *mundanus* never.

The people of the world are, as already mentioned in § 8, *genus humanum* as contrasted with the *diuinum genus*. In the *Testimonia* they are called simply *gentes*, and also in *Ep.* 63 (704. 2, 711. 3, 6 [3]). *Exterae gentes* occurs only 740. 20, and is not Cyprian's own, but the language of the Spanish letter whose contents he is reciting. Is it the case that the remoter churches used archaic language through their isolation, when terms had changed in the more central? We have seen that *hypodiaconus* only was used at Carthage, while *subdiaconus* has been introduced at Rome [4]. *Allophyli* occurs once in the *Testimonia* (83. 19); *alienigena* four times; once in the

[1] Cf. *uermium edax poena* 410. 9.

[2] In *Acta Sem. Erlang.* iii. p. 432, on the Palatine version of Hermas. *Mundus* is even rarer in Tertullian than in Cyprian.

[3] An additional evidence, if one were needed, for its being among the earliest of Cyprian's writings, composed before his style was formed.

[4] According to Haussleiter's article, cited above, in the older and, as he says, African version of Hermas, *gentes* or *exterae gentes* is almost constant. We see that Cyprian only uses *gentes* in his earliest writings, and *exterae gentes* never. *Nationes* also is avoided, though it stood in Cyprian's Bible; see Koffmane, p. 23.

Testimonia (83. 25), once in this reproduction of the Spanish letter, 740. 21, and twice in indirect citation of Scripture, 342. 2, 366. 22. It is thrice cited from Malachi 4. 1. It is to be noticed that, though *alienigena* occurs sparingly in the Vulgate as revised by Jerome, it is very common in the books where the old version has been left untouched. None of these words, then, are used by Cyprian after he had formed his style. He confined himself to *ethnicus* (775. 21, &c.) and *gentilis*. The change that was passing over the language of the Church may be seen in the rarity of *ethnicus*, though that seems the most common word in Tertullian for 'heathen [1].' Even in the titles to the *Testimonia*, where Cyprian has used so many archaic words, only *gentilis* is found. There seems to be no other synonym in Cyprian; *profanus* is only descriptive. Though the word is Biblical, yet it is not common either in Scripture or in Tertullian, and Cyprian in all probability borrowed it from his knowledge of classical literature. He usually reserves it for heretics, but *profanus arbiter*, *templa*, *dei* are found 3. 11, 399. 4, 411. 7, and the word 366. 4, 23 of heathens.

Idolum is constantly used, and also, though less commonly, *simulacrum*; *figmentum* occurs thrice (362. 15, 399. 5, 411. 8), as in Novatian, *Trin.* 3, and Tertullian, *Jud.* 1; it was perhaps frequent in the Old Latin; it still stands in Vulg. Sap. 14. 16. *Idolatra* occurs 645. 19, *idolatria* often [2]. *Ara* is used 242. 24, &c., *altare*, for the sake of variety, of a heathen altar, 243. 1, but never again. For these words see § 16. There is nothing remarkable about the words used for heathen worship; *sacrificia celebrare* 673. 15, *sacrificare idolis* 242. 13, *sacrificantes* 238. 5, &c. *Adscendere* stands alone 242. 11, *ad-*

[1] *Gentilis* is rare in Tertullian except in *Ad Ux.* and *Cult. Fem.*, where he uses it freely. He constantly uses *nationes*, very rarely *gentes*. *Allophylus* and *extrancus* are occasional variants for his normal *ethnicus*.

[2] So these forms are certainly to be spelt; see especially 325. 22, and 740. 12, 22; in these two last instances Hartel's MSS. have no variant. Cf. Wölfflin in his *Archiv*, 5. 496 and 8. 6, Miodoński on *De Aleatt.* 5. 3, and Koffmane, p. 37. Tertullian uses the full form (yet cf. 368. 4 Reiff.), and in Lucifer also (see Hartel's Article in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 3. 23), the MS. has *idololatria*, &c. more often than the syncopated form.

scendere Capitolium 254. 16; cf. 242. 19, 531. 19. This would seem to have become a synonym for the offering of sacrifice. A worshipper of idols is often called *sacrilegus*[1], usually in rhetorical contrast to *sacerdos, sacrificium*, &c. 253. 22, 399. 5, &c.

§ 30. The trouble caused by the heathen to the Church is *persecutio, tribulatio* or *pressura*. The two last are renderings of θλίψις from Scripture. *Pressura*[2], though its use is not always precise, is more definitely connected with persecution than *tribulatio*. The descriptions of confessorship and martyrdom as *aliud baptisma* (i. e. *alterum*) or *sanguinis baptisma* (319. 4, 796. 1, cf. *Pass. Perp.* 18. 21, &c.), *purificatio confessionis* 578. 26 (cf. 786. 24 of Baptism), *tormenta quae martyras Dei consecrant et ipsa passionis probatione sanctificant* 481. 12, and the like, belong rather to Theology than to the study of language. That which is confessed is *nomen* or *nomen Christi*; usually the former, e. g. 103. 23. 278. 3, 795. 18, &c. The language used concerning modes of torture, &c. does not belong to this subject; it is naturally often rhetorical. Prison, for instance, is rarely *carcer*; *hospitium carceris* 494. 2, 577. 22, *poenalis locus* 577. 12, *poenale receptaculum* 578. 15, and other paraphrases take its place. There is a great variety of language for the martyrs' reward, in such *Epp.* as 28, 37, 38, 39, 76, which need not be given here. The characteristic word is *palma* 402. 15, 493. 20, 831. 24, &c., which takes the place of the *brauium* of Tertullian. Cyprian read it, and not *brauium*, in 1 Cor. 9. 24 (141. 5, according to the true text, 330. 1, 493. 7).

All who stand firm under persecution are *stantes*; those

[1] Cf. *De Aleatt.* 7, with Harnack's note, p. 23, who says that *sacrilegium* = *idololatria* is common in Sulpicius Severus.

[2] This word, which Jerome has almost banished from the Vulgate, where it now stands in only seven passages—six in the N. T., which Jerome probably overlooked, one in the Apocrypha, and none in the O. T.—must have been as common in the Old Latin as *tribulatio*. In Cyprian its common use is of persecution, e.g. 241. 23, 833. 14, of want, less often, as 291. 26, 479. 4, and also of trouble generally. It is used literally of overcrowding, 534. 13, by Lucianus. The Roman Christians still used *thlibomeni*, 487. 21, as in Cornelius' letter in Eus. *H. E.* 6. 43. 11, and *Canon. Apost.* 22.

who suffer, whether fatally or not, are *confessores* (*confitentes* once, 615. 5) or *martyres*. *Testis* (cf. *Vita, init. Cyprianus . . . testis Dei gloriosus*) does not seem to be used. *Confessor* and *martyr* are used equally often, and quite indifferently[1]; the pleonastic *martyres et confessores* 513. 5, 520. 17, &c. *Confiteri*, *confessio* stand both alone and with *Christum*, *Christi* dependent. *Confessio nominis* 653. 22, &c. *Martyrium* or *martyria facere* occurs several times, perhaps on the analogy of *stipendia facere*; *martyria edere* once, 742. 3; *martyrium tollere* 653. 12. In 698. 3 is the otiose *confessionis martyria*, and 260. 7 *uirtutum martyria*[2]. *Passio* and *passiones* are frequent.

The *uirtutes*, *laudes*, *gloriae*, all meaning meritorious actions, of the confessors are often mentioned, e.g. 547. 3, 577. 1, 578. 12[3]. But the characteristic virtue of the confessor is *tolerantia* 204. 20, 415. 14, &c. The wealth of epithets for the confessors is great; *gloriosus*, *inlibatus*, *inmaculatus*, *inconcussus*, *inmotus*, &c. *Beatus*, used in addressing them, has already been mentioned; cf. 576. 22 *beatum facit prima et una confessio*. Was it a recognized title?

Exile, either voluntarily endured to escape death, or inflicted as a punishment, is often mentioned. The sufferer is always *extorris*[4], *profugus*, &c. being only used for variety, and *exul*, I think, never. Bishops are sentenced to *relegatio*; Lucius of Rome, for instance, 695. 19. If this instance stood alone it would be a strong confirmation of the statement of

[1] Cf. Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, ii. p. 26 f. 'The Decian persecution would seem to have been instrumental in fixing this distinction between martyrs and confessors.' The traces of it in Cyprian are very slight; 627. 8 *Moyse tunc adhuc confessore nunc iam martyre*, and Nemesianus' description in *Ep.* 77 (834. 15) of martyrdom as *magna confessio*. *Confessor* and *confessio* are very rare in Tertullian; they were perhaps only just coming into use when he wrote, through a popular dislike of the Greek equivalents.

[2] While *confessio* has almost lost the sense of 'confession of sin,' *exhomologesis* has lost that of 'confessing,' in the sense of recognizing, God's glory. Yet it must have had it in Cyprian's Bible (260. 10, cf. *Test.* 3. 114), though he preferred to take it in the meaning which he always gives to the word.

[3] *Laus* in this sense also occurs in the singular, e.g. 621. 8. Cyprian may have remembered Virgil, *Aen.* 5. 355 *primam merui qui laude coronam*.

[4] There is some evidence, e.g. 507. 2, 616. 16, 633. 11, for Cyprian's having used the vulgar form *extorrens*.

the Felician catalogue that Lucius was born *patre purpureo*, since *relegatio* affected only the higher classes. Yet both in the *Vita* and in the *Acta* Cyprian is sentenced not to *relegatio* but to *exilium*, while we read in 731. 21 of a large number of bishops *in exilium relegati*. If the episcopate could be desired for worldly reasons, as Cyprian says in *Laps*. 6 and *Ep*. 65. 3, they could hardly be among the *tenuiores* of Roman law, and subject to the heavier punishments of such[1]. Voluntary exile is *cedere*, 244. 13, *secedere*, 244. 10, 14, and often, *recedere* still more commonly, 570. 15, 659. 20, &c.

In connexion with confessorship Cyprian uses many metaphors, especially those of sacrifice, of warfare, of the arena and the race. Martyrs are *uictimae* 698. 4, *hostiae* 830. 23, *hostiae et uictimae* 652. 24; cf. 561. 18 in the Roman *Ep*. 31. The Church is *castra Christi*, *caelestia*, &c., often certainly, perhaps always, in the sense of army, not of camp; e. g. 363. 12, 693. 11, 806. 5; yet cf. 490. 16. Confession is constantly *proelium* (492. 8 *proeliatores et adsertores sui nominis*), *certamen*, e. g. 545. 7 ff., &c. Christians are *commilitones* 686. 15; *militare Deo* occurs 297. 15, *militia* for the Christian warfare, campaign, conduct in battle, is frequent, 649. 13, 658. 28, &c.[2] *Commeatus* of respite from martyrdom occurs thrice, 494. 22, 581. 20, 632. 24[3].

The Christian conflict is also compared to that of the gladiator. In 498. 12 the devil is seen in vision as a *retiarius*.

[1] Probably, therefore, the possibilities of suffering for Cornelius mentioned in *Ep*. 55. 6 (630. 21 ff.) are only rhetoric. In the hostile *Ep*. 8 (486. 1) the Roman clergy call Cyprian a *persona insignis*. They seem to be magnifying his fault in retiring by alluding to his position in society, which would have saved him, at the worst, from such punishment as humble Christians endured. Yet in *Ep*. 76 (829. 13, 17) we find bishops suffering from *infamia uincula*, *infamia*. This is the only use of the legal term *infamia* in connexion with this persecution. Some of the bishops may have been of humble position, but legality was not considered in Valerian's persecution. Clergy of all orders were being treated as convicts in the mines.

[2] *Militia* is equivalent to *exercitus* in 545. 8 *caelestis militiae signa mouistis*, and 657. 24. *Miles* is collective 491. 21.

[3] It is used in the meaning of recovery from sickness, 309. 1, 14; so also in Sen. *Ep*. 54. 1.

In 664. 23 the *galea* is described, covering the whole head, and seems to be that of a gladiator. The very term *stantes* is identical with, if not borrowed from, the gladiatorial name for the victor[1]. The gladiator's food is used as an illustration in the Roman *Ep.* 31 (557. 18) *ita illas* (*literas*) *uoto esuriente suscepimus ut ad certamen inimici ex illis nos satis pastos et saginatos gaudeamus*; literally, of a gladiator in *Ad Don.* 9. 1. Further passages, such as 15. 20 *cum semel pectus caelestis sagina saturauerit*, 401. 17 *diebus quadraginta ieiunat per quem ceteri saginantur*, Tert. *Res. Carn.* 8 *caro corpore et sanguine Christi uescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur*, suggest that there may have been in the Old Latin Bible a use of *saginare* as meaning to strengthen or satisfy, in such passages, for instance, as Matt. 5. 6. But there seems to be no evidence of any such use; there is certainly none in Tertullian or Cyprian. It seems therefore more probable that the word, even in these cases, comes from the same metaphor[2]. Apart from this use the word is employed by Cyprian in its usual classical sense of gluttony, 259. 6, 468. 20. The *agon*[3] or *certamen* which was the object of the *spectaculum* (all these words are equally common) was often athletic, but sometimes clearly gladiatorial; e.g. 526. 15 *acies adhuc geritur et agon cottidie celebratur*, 578. 13 *agon unus sed multiplici proeliorum numerositate congestus*. In the latter the confessor has to meet a succession of fresh opponents, like the *ter fortis* of Quint. *Decl.* 271. Indeed Cyprian's use of *fortis* seems generally to be the technical one of Quintilian's *Declamations*, in which it is common, as also in Quint. *Inst.* 7. 7, not merely meaning brave, but implying that the courage has been shown in action, and the reward earned[4]. The

[1] See the examples from inscriptions collected by Friedländer, *Darstellungen*, ii. 363, 518.

[2] For the gladiatorial use cf. Apul. *Met.* 4. 14, where the robbers are described as *pulpis saginantes* (intransitive) in preparation for their *instans militia*; Quint. *Decl.* 9. 5 (cited by Mayor on Juv. 11. 20) *alebat deuotum corpus grauior omni fame sagina.* For the word cf. Koffmane, p. 99.

[3] Cf. Is. 7. 13 in 74. 4, 492. 21, and for the subject Origen, *Protrept.* 18.

[4] The use of so unchristian an illustration as that of the gladiator, if it did

general language of training, running, receiving a crown, &c. in such passages as 317. 19, 493. 3, 663. 18, &c. is, of course, in the main Pauline, but has been much developed. In 580. 4 there is an allusion to some arrangement of the games. The confessor passes through a *geminus agon*; first *cursus* and then a *certamen fortius*. Is this wrestling?

There are several notices of the reverence paid to Martyrs. The date of their death is recorded, 503. 14, though Cyprian never calls it their *natalis*, and *commemorationes* or *memoriae* (the words are probably synonymous, *memoria* not having the later sense of 'tomb') held for them, 503. 15, 583. 12. Sacrifice is offered for them as for others who are deceased; cf. pp. 267, 284, and not simply in memory of their victory.

For martyrdom as a *baptisma sanguinis* see especially *Ep.* 73. 21, 22, and p. 319. 5 ff. The thought is common both in Cyprian and Tertullian, e.g. *Scorp.* 12, *Bapt.* 16 (174. 6, 214. 14 Reiff.).

The opposite to *confessio*, *confiteri* is *professio* 256. 25 (cf. Novatian, 550. 24), *profiteri* 238. 25, and perhaps 842. 5. Though *lapsus* is constant for a fallen Christian, *labi* does not occur except in compound tenses, as 541. 7, 650. 18, &c. *Apostatare* is used only 652. 10; it is, no doubt, simply an accident that *apostata* refers only to heretics, 632. 10, 647. 16; cf. 197. 26, 825. 18. The downfall itself is *lapsus* 648. 15, &c., but more often *ruina* 239. 18, 501. 16, 721. 17, &c. Metaphors from death, disease, shipwreck, &c. are common. Many have been given already in § 25; much of this language is also used in reference to schism: see the next section. The kinds of *lapsi* mentioned are *libellatici*[1], of whose crime

not arise from the circumstances of common life, must have come from the Stoics. Friedländer, *Darstellungen*, ii. 400 n., cites from De Rossi a Christian vessel found at Tunis with the figure of a victorious *thrax* or *retiarius* upon it. De Rossi says that it is a symbol of the triumphant soul; Friedländer would have it to be a charioteer. Whatever archaeological reasons he may have, no weight can be attached to his further argument that Christians would never have used such a symbol. Cyprian, we have seen, had no such scruple. For his relation to Seneca see p. 202, and cf. Tert. *Mart.* 1.

[1] *Libellus* is used by Cyprian for his own treatises, 36. 7, 623. 16, 798. 19,

a variety is that of those *qui accepta fecissent* 551. 3 (Novatian), whatever the exact meaning of that may be; *turificati* and *sacrificati*. These names are perfectly definite in their employment and belong to history rather than to a study of language.

§ 31. *Haeresis* and *schisma* are identical terms in Cyprian, though constantly used, after his pleonastic fashion, together[1]. *Haereticus*[2] and *schismaticus* are equally constant and identical in meaning. *Haeresin, schisma facere* are also normal, 746. 6, 754. 17, &c. Cyprian tried several Latin substitutes, but apparently was not satisfied with any; *discretio et separatio* 603. 2, *discessio* 619. 15, *schisma et discidium* 666. 20, *discidium conpaginis, fraternitatis, unitatis* 231. 10, 604. 16, 672. 8, *discordia* (not moral, but actual schism) 222. 7, 642. 24[3]; cf. *diuortium* 215. 8. The authors of such division are *diuersa pars* 600. 1, i.e. hostile, cf. *conuenticula diuersa* 220. 24; *discrepans*[4] *factio* 602. 7; *discordes* often, though *dis-*

&c.; of a letter from the lapsed, claiming communion, in *Ep.* 33 (568. 3), but there is some doubt of the genuineness of this *Ep.*; of the letters of the confessors readmitting the *lapsi* to communion, 523. 19, &c., which are also called *litterae*, 541. 6, 9; finally, of these certificates given by the magistrate that a Christian had sacrificed, 341. 19, &c. The use in *Ep.* 33 resembles the Egyptian *libellus* lately discovered; see Harnack in *Theol. Litztg.* 1894, p. 38. The thing existed in Tertullian's time, though he does not name it; cf. Kolberg p. 146.

[1] Cf. 598. 16, 746. 6, where *haeresis* clearly means schism. The very fact that they are used together is in Cyprian's style an evidence that they are identical; cf. *sauciati et uulnerati, preces et orationes*, and so many more. The only passages where there seems to be a distinction of meaning are a few in which they are joined by *uel—uel*, instead of *et—et*, but there are so many instances in Cyprian in which *uel* is not disjunctive that no argument can be drawn from these; besides them there are only 614. 14 *schismaticus immo haereticus furor*, and 805. 1 *cum uero nulla omnino haeresis sed neque aliquod schisma habere salutaris baptismi sanctificationem foris possit*, neither of which is more than rhetoric.

[2] Cornelius seems to use *haeresiacus* 611. 13, 612. 14, which Cyprian rejects.

[3] Jerome, *Ep.* 94. 2, ventures on *scissura*; cf. Vulgate, 1 Cor. 11. 18; Cyprian and Tertullian do not cite this text. Cyprian only has the word from 3 Reg. 11. 31, in 216. 2. In *Sent.* 5 (440. 1) occurs *qui diuisionem faciunt, hoc est schismaticos et haereticos*. The Echternach Gospels stand alone in reading *discisio* for σχίσμα in Joh. 7. 43; Vulgate *dissensio*. There was clearly a strong desire for a Latin word.

[4] The verb is used absolutely 497. 14, 529. 2.

cordans and *discordiosus* are not found in the special sense. Their work is constantly *scindere ecclesiam*, *unitatem*, &c. 224. 11, 605. 6, &c., *rescindere* 642. 24, *discerpere* 231. 11, 604. 14, *distrahere scindere laniare* 598. 20. *Abscedere* 631. 21, *discedere* 733. 2, &c., and especially *recedere* 777. 21, &c., are common, as are *segregare se* 214. 20, 745. 5, &c., *foras egredi* 757. 16, *exire, derelinquere ecclesiam* and similar phrases. *Rebellio* is frequent; *rebellare contra pacem*, &c., 472. 4, 592. 25, and often. *Conspiratio*, *seditio*, *factio*, *seductio* (725. 16), are also common. Beside these Cyprian uses *aemuli*, *aemulantes*, *aemulatio discissa*[1] 222. 3, 598. 14, 604. 14, &c.; *praeuaricatio* 213. 17, *praeuaricator*[2] 742. 6, 759. 3, 786. 13, in all cases combined with *proditor*. Generally speaking all the language used or suitable for evil spirits or heathens, traitors or madmen, is bestowed upon heretics; perhaps the most common terms are *profanus*, *adulter*[3] and *sacrilegus*; the three are combined, 745. 12. *Praesumptio* (add to Hartel's list 747. 24, 801. 16, 807. 12, and in another sense 459. 14), *pertinacia*[4] 600. 2, *tumor*, *stupor*, *furor*, *uenenum* are characteristic terms. *Maligni*[5] *et detrahentes* 629. 3, *perditi*, *perditio*, *perdere et perire* are very common, as are the metaphors of *parricidium* and *naufragium*.

For the meeting of heretics Cyprian avoids *synagoga* (twice in *Ep.* 75, 819. 24, 820. 25). He twice uses *conuenticulum* instead; *conuenticula diuersa* 220. 23, *conuenticulum perditae factionis* 683. 6.

§ 32. That Cyprian's list of Greek words is short, and that

[1] For *aemulus* = *hostis* see Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 338. *Discissa aemulatio* must be for *aemulatio schismatica*; so *error scissus* 599. 1 = *schismatis*.

[2] These words, with *praeuaricari*, are used several times, generally of the effect of a bad life, 198. 23, 309. 27, 388. 17, 423. 7, 427. 7; *praeuaricatio ueritatis* = *lapsus* 592. 13; *praeuaricatio* = *haeresis* is used by Cornelius also, 612. 15.

[3] See § 9, and cf. *uitiare* 614. 10.

[4] Does this mean cruelty, in deserting their mother? For *pertinax* in this sense see p. 305.

[5] This is an indirect evidence that in Cyprian's time *malignus* = *diabolus* was in use; cf. 425. 2.

there are few for which he has not attempted to provide a substitute, has already been said on p. 195. There is only one Greek ecclesiastical term, *symbolum*, which appears to occur for the first time in him (756. 7, cf. 818. 10), and he only uses it once. It is no doubt a mere accident that no earlier instance has survived. Cyprian's object was not to introduce, but to banish, Greek words. In the preceding pages the ecclesiastical words have been set out in detail. It may suffice here to set them together without further comment.

Those for which Cyprian provides no substitute are *acoluthus*, *angelus*, *angelicus*, *apostolus* (also of messengers of evil 642. 17), *blasphemus*, *blasphemia*, *blasphemare*, *cathedra*, *catholicus*, *clerus*, *clericus*, *ecclesia*, *ecclesiasticus*, *ecstasis*, *euangelium*, *euangelicus*, *exorcismus*, *exorcista* (never *exorcizare*), *hypodiaconus* (leaving *subdiaconus* to Rome), *idolatra*, *idolatria*, *laicus*, *presbyter*, *presbyterium*, *conpresbyter*, *propheta*, *propheticus*, *pseudochristus*, *pseudoepiscopus* (*pseudoapostolus* and *pseudopropheta* are words of Stephanus, not of Cyprian), *zelus* and *zelare* (never the deponent). There are only two other Greek words of Christian sense which he freely uses, *agon* (with *agonisticus*), and *petra* (see pp. 292, 280). A few Biblical words, as *botruus* 578. 1, 705. 20, 754. 9, *grabatus* 762. 16, *lepra* 226. 25, *leprosus* 671. 3, &c., *moechus* 638. 11, *patriarcha* 308. 9, &c., *zizania* 622. 15, 16, a few more which had been thoroughly adopted in Latin, classical or post-classical, as *aphronitra* pl. = 'cakes of soap' 761. 4 (cf. Treb. Poll. *Gall.* 6. 5), *authenticus* 489. 16 (Tert., Jct.), *catasta* 581. 1 (see p. 270), *chorus* 313. 27, *collyrium* 384. 15, *conchylium* (= *murex*) 197. 18, *cynocephalus* 360. 6, *stibium* 384. 15; *tropaeum*, *tyrannicus*, &c., need not be noticed. *Plasmare* 805. 15, *plastica* 198. 7, *protoplastus* 190. 15 (also in Novatian, *Trin.* 8) are reminiscences of Tertullian; *plasma* 468. 12, not used by Tertullian, probably comes direct from Irenaeus.

Cyprian twice shows that he had some knowledge of Greek. In 762. 9 he ridicules his opponents who used the word

clinici, and in 765. 18 adopts the humorous *peripatetici* in contrast; similarly in 694. 3 he contrasts *sophia dominica* with *saecularis philosophia*.

But the most important group of Greek words are those of Church use for which Cyprian employs, more or less frequently, a Latin substitute. These are:—

agape only *Test.* 3. 3 *tit.*, coupled with the synonymous *dilectio*[1].

allophyli only 83. 19 (*Test.* 3. 16). See p. 287.

apostata, apostatare, see p. 293. Much less common than *desertor* and other Latin terms.

baptismus, baptisma, baptismum; see § 15. Cyprian's normal use is *baptisma* nom. acc., with oblique cases from *baptismus*, and plural *baptismata*. No other plural forms are found. But 781. 20 *baptismatis* without variant, and 787. 22 *baptismate*, though there is much evidence for *baptismo*. There is no instance of nom. *baptismus*, and only, I think, 775. 15, 776. 7 for *baptismum* acc.; in the latter it is neuter, if the text may be trusted. In the *Sentt.* there is one clear instance of the masc., two clearly neuter, twenty-six doubtful, twenty of *baptisma*. Tertullian wavers between these forms as much as Cyprian. *Baptisma*, abl., ought to be read 788. 8 and 796. 13, as in *Ep.* 75 (815. 11); cf. Koffmane, p. 36. *Baptizare* and *rebaptizare* are used without variant except in paraphrase. It has been already suggested that *tinctio, tinguere* are avoided, as Montanist words, and only used as descriptions of the heretical rite.

catecumenus 106. 18, 488. 2, 795. 16 (*catechizare* in *Ep.* 75 (823. 17)); *audiens* twice.

chrisma once only 768. 14, and there explained by *unctio*.

christianus, see p. 254; emphatic and comparatively rare.

daemon, daemonium; see p. 286. Almost always *immundi spiritus*, &c.

diabolus often, yet more frequently *inimicus*, &c.; see p. 285.

diaconus[2], *diaconium*; for these and for *minister, administratio* as probably equivalent, see p. 260.

[1] But there is strong evidence for *agape* having stood in Cyprian's Bible. It is used 114. 1, 115. 13, 116, 17, 133. 8 in Lord Crawford's MS. (8th cent.), as well as in the best of those cited by Hartel.

[2] With the exception of abl. *baptisma*, *diaconus* is the only Greek word with the form of which Cyprian took liberties; *diaconem* should perhaps be read in 618. 12; *diacones* 565. 11 (doubtful *ib.* 5), 839. 16, 840. 10; *diaconi-*

episcopus, episcopatus, coepiscopus; see p. 258. *Antistes* and *sacerdos* constantly. *Coepiscopus* seems to be a coinage of Cyprian's.

ethnicus rarely for *gentilis*; see p. 288.

eucharistia comparatively rare; see p. 266.

exhomologesis always except 258. 18, where *confessio* is used; see p. 282.

haeresis, haereticus constantly; for Latin synonyms see p. 294.

idolum is varied by *figmentum* and *simulacrum*; see p. 288.

martyr, martyrium indiscriminately with *confessor*, &c.; see p. 290.

prophetare 223. 17, 339. 26, elsewhere *praedicere*, &c.

scandalum (add to Hartel's list 474. 19, 508. 3) five times, *scandalizare* thrice; *offendiculum* perhaps only 304. 14.

schisma, schismaticus constantly; for variants see p. 294.

synagoga only *Test.* I. 20 *tit.* In the sense of 'heretical assembly' *conuenticulum* takes its place 220. 23, 683. 6.

typus often, yet more often *imago*, &c.; see § 7.

Noteworthy Greek words used by other writers in the *Epp.* and *Sententiae* are—*catechizare* 823. 17, *cimiterium* (of a Roman burial-place) 840. 9[1], *daemoniacus* 436. 16, *exorcizare* 436. 16, &c. (confined to *Sentt.*), *petrarium* (a conjecture) 534. 18, *pseudobaptizatus* 438. 4, *tartarus* 555. 19, *thlibomeni* 487. 21, *zelotypus* 533. 13.

§ 33. The length of this paper makes it impossible to do more than select out of Cyprian's general vocabulary a few of the most remarkable words; and especially those which appear for the first time in his writings. Beside the ordinary stock of words of a writer of the third century, common to Apuleius, Tertullian[2], Justin, the Old Latin Bible, &c., there

bus usually in the addresses (*diaconis, Epp.* 14, 39). See Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 262. Διάκων is found in third-century Greek Inscriptions, Pagan and Christian (Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 442; Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, I. 501). Conversely πάτρων in Theoph. *Ad Autol.* 3. 27 and often in inscriptions.

[1] Cited from a despatch from Rome; in the *Acta* of Cyprian § 1 it is used by the proconsul Paternus. Koffmane p. 31 has overlooked it in Tert. *de An.* 51 (383. 16 Reiff.), perhaps the earliest instance.

[2] Oehler's Index to Tertullian is very imperfect. He omits, among others, these words for which Cyprian has been in several cases cited as the earliest authority;—*adhucusque, Jud.* 7 (Cyprian 495. 18, 679. 13, the first instances according to Thielmann in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 6, p. 69); *deponere* = 'depose,'

are many borrowed from classical poetry, of which some examples have already been given, and many found in Plautus and other early writers, which do not recur till the third century. All these classes of words are, with few exceptions, omitted here, as are those which have been previously discussed. Words which seem to be new in form are marked with an asterisk, those which are new in meaning with an obelus.

The most noteworthy substantives, arranged alphabetically according to declension, are:—

†*culturae* 646. 19. This may mean works of agriculture, though for the pl. in this sense Georges only cites Lucr. 5. 1448, whom Cyprian does not seem to have read. But his love for parallelism makes it more likely that it corresponds with the preceding clause, and means fields. In this sense Georges only cites Salvian, *Gub. Dei,* 7. 2 (157. 20 Pauly).

†*exultantia=gaudium* 832. 25. In Georges only in the sense of attack, and first in Gellius.

fauentia 576. 17=*fauor.* Only cited from Accius, tr. 510.

**inaudientia* 569. 22, invented by Cyprian for alliteration.

**lupana=meretrix* 196. 14, 699. 25; also in *De Spect.* 5 (A. 8. 5). Cf. Wölfflin, in his *Archiv,* 1892, p. 8, and Haussleiter, *ib.* p. 145.

**commentarii=commentarienses* 841. 3. The latter is common enough, but Cyprian's form does not seem to occur again. But there is some manuscript evidence for *frumentarii,* which is read by Rigault and Fell.

**diaconium* 617. 1; cf. p. 260, and Koffmane, p. 25[1].

**excidium=mors* 312. 22, apparently an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, derived from *excĭdere*; cf. *C.I.L.* 8. 9513 (from Caesarea Mauret.) *xlv annis uobis uixi, in xlvi excidi quando datum est.*

Fug. 1 (Cypr. 472. 6, 739. 23); *deuotio*='loyalty,' *Scorp.* 5 (Cypr. 631. 5, 660. 9); *mortalis*='deadly,' *Pud.* 19 *fin.* twice (Cypr. 407. 21, 469. 3, 725. 16 and *de Aleatt.* 6. 11; cf. Hilgenfeld's edition, p. 73, and Rönsch *Beitr.* 2. 32); *numerositas Monog.* 4 (Cypr. 214, 5, &c.); *quamdiu=donec, Idol.* 15, *Natt.* 1. 7, &c. (Cypr. 496. 15, 649. 21, 679. 3).

[1] If Hartel's almost certain conjecture in *De Aleatt.* 3. 2 (improved by Miodoński in *Comment. Woelfflin,* p. 373 ff. to *in episcopium idem*) for *episcopi idem* be accepted, the parallel form is brought back from the age of Hilary, Aug. and *xii Abus.* almost to that of Cyprian.

Georges in the *Jahresbericht*, vol. 40, p. 126 gives the word this derivation, citing Prud. *Apoth.* 607 for the sense of 'sunset.' But Thielmann (Wölfflin's *Archiv*, I. p. 76) makes it a vulgar derivative from *excīdere* for *excedere*, in the sense of *excessus*. He gives some of Rönsch's (*It. V.* p. 356) examples of *decidere=decedere* (i. e. *mori*), and adds others of his own; but this seems a less probable account. It would be more likely that the word is formed on the analogy of *discidium*, which often enough means no more than 'departure [1].'

†*fomentum=fomes* 10. 7, 194. 12, 591. 18, all pl. Arnob. 2. 62 (98. 3 Reiff.).

**inpiamentum* 724. 13. Cf. Min. Fel. 28. 5 *inpiatis sacris*.

†*oblectamenta et inlecebrae*, certainly synonyms, 501. 4. For *oblectare* in this sense see Koffmane, p. 95.

†*trauersaria* 829. 21; omitted by Georges in the sense of 'fetters' or rather, perhaps, 'stocks.' Ducange cites Greg. Tur. *De Vita Patrum*, 7, Forcellini-De Vit only this passage.

uultum 259. 22 *neclecto capillo, uulto nubilo*. Hartel cites no variant, and this may therefore be a mere misprint. But in Apul. *Met.* 4. 25 (71. 30 Eyss.) *saeuiore uulto* is read without variant in Eyssenhardt's MSS.; and it is quite possible that Cyprian has chosen the rare form for uniformity of termination. Cf. Georges, *Lex. d. lat. Wortformen* [2].

Of the third declension the only class in which Cyprian displays much invention is that of verbal nouns in *-tio*.

**acerbatio* (pl.) 600. 21; the only example in Georges. Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 79 cites Gloss. Cyrill.

†*adflictatio mali*='infliction' 685. 1. Georges only cites *Cod. Theod.* for this use.

**adunatio*; add 712. 1 to Hartel's instances. Paucker, *Suppl.* cites Cassiod. and Boethius. Cyprian is the first Christian

[1] Cf. *exitium*, which in the third and fourth centuries had been weakened to a synonym of *exitus=mors*. Apul. *Met.* 5. 27 (95. 4 Eyss.) *mortis exitium* means no more than Cyprian's *mortis exitus* (502. 17, 632. 19). So also in Firm. Mat. *Err.* 2. 7 and 28. 13 *animaduersionis exitium* is exactly equivalent to *diuinae animaduersionis exitus* in 18. 4. Cf. Oehler's note to Tert. i. 518.

[2] Cf. *amictūm*, Novatian, *Trin.* 21 (16), which Georges, *Lex. d. lat. Wortformen* only cites from Isidore; and *sepultum fecit=sepulcrum*, *C. I. L.* 8. 9798 (Safar, Numidia), though this might be from *sepultus*. Georges has not the word.

writer to use the verb freely, though it occurs in Tert. *Pud.* 5 and is Biblical.

**arcessitio* = *mors*, see p. 283; *arcessitio dominica* 309. 19. It is curious that this word, which Cyprian uses five times, and Lucianus (534. 5) once, should not have been adopted by later writers.

†*auulsio* 304. 13 *de excedentibus caris funebris et tristis auulsio.* Paucker, *Subindenda*, cites from Paulin. Nol. *Ep.* 13. 8, and it is used by Tert. *Carn. Xti* 20 of physical separation.

calcatio 705. 19 *torcularis calcatio et pressura* from Old Latin, Es. 63. 2 (*ib.* l. 13). This word is omitted by Georges, and by Rönsch in *It. V.*, *Beitr.*, and *Collect.*, but noticed by Paucker in his *Suppl.*

†*concarnatio*, *Test.* 2. 2 *tit.*; see p. 248. Though *incarnatus* is used by Novatian, *Trin.* 19, Cyprian has no such form. *Concarnatio* is used in another sense (from Mt. 19. 5) by Tert. *Monog.* 9.

†*conceptio perniciosa* 307. 29; sense invented to carry on the preceding *conceptum.*

corroboratio 386. 1. Not in Vulg. or Tert. Paucker, *Suppl.* gives 2 Pet. 3. 17 from Aug. (without reference) *ne decidatis . . . a corroboratione uestra* (Vulg. *firmitate*)[1].

†*detractatio* = calumny 689. 19. Paucker, *Suppl.* only cites Cassian, *Coll.* 9. 3.

†*dissimulatio* = delay 358. 23 *praedandi dissimulatio nulla, nulla cunctatio.* Since it is Cyprian's constant habit to say the same thing twice, there can be no reasonable doubt of the meaning. Cf. *dissimulare* in Virg. *Aen.* 4. 368, and Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 523.

†*examinatio* (metaphorical) 500. 4. Arnob., Ulpian, &c.; cf. Paucker, *Suppl.* The verb is so used 218. 18, 409. 22, 686. 18.

†*factio* = 'factiousness' 602. 21, 618. 12. Georges only cites Cassian, *Coll.* 22. 6.

[1] Other resemblances of Cyprian to 2 Pet. (i. e. words first found in both, and not again till much later), which suggest the thought that the Vulgate of this Epistle is the Old Latin, as in some other of the Catholic Epp., are *cognitio* (*Patris et Filii*) 790. 20, which in this connexion is found in the Vulgate only in 2 Pet., *incessabilis* 793. 10 and 2 Pet. 2. 14 (it recurs in Hieron. *Ep.* 16. 2); but *indesinens* 394. 13 is the alternative reading in 2 Pet. 2. 14 of *Cod. Tolet.* (Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 226), and also first recurs in Cyprian.

**incursatio* 364. 2. Nonius, Heges.
**interminatio* 476. 2. See Rönsch, *Collect.* p. 37, and Paucker, *Suppl.*
†*ostensio*=*uisio* 651. 7, 17, 734. 2, all pl.; see p. 250.
palpatio = 'flattery' 569. 17. Plautus, Cassian, *Inst.* 10. 17, Interp. Orig. in Mt. 6. 4 (Paucker, *Kl. Beitr.*).
**ploratio* 369. 17; only cited from Aug. *Serm.*, but omitted by Regnier.
†*pullulatio* (metaphorical) 352. 16; cf. *pullulare* 224. 14, 806. 10. Paucker, *Subrelicta*, only cites this and Praedestinatus in this sense.
†*seminatio* (metaphorical) 642. 24, 689. 17, 788. 19; cf. *seminare* 352. 15, 577. 19, 618. 8.
†*tinctio*='heretical Baptism,' 772. 8, 800. 7, and in *Ep.* 75 (815. 20); see p. 264.

**celsitas* 583. 25; omitted by Georges, and even by Paucker.
†*mortalitas* = *pestis* 301. 12, &c., in *De Mort.* Cited by Georges only from the Chronologer of 354.
†*rusticitas*='agriculture' 646. 18. Cited in this sense only from Palladius, and in Cyprian no doubt used for epiploce with *rusticum* preceding. The word occurs in *Quod Id.* 2 (20. 7).

Beside these the following deserve mention :—

acceptor 692. 23; Wölfflin, in *Archiv*, 8. 123, cited only from Lucilius, the Old Latin Levit. 11. 13, 16 (Vulg. *accipiter*), and this; see also Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 521.
†*nigror* (concrete) 198. 1, 384. 19, equivalent to *puluis niger* 198. 8, 259. 19; cf. the classical *rubor* 198. 1, 8.
**putramen*, 247. 20 *putraminibus amputatis*, 684. 22 *neque enim sic putramina quaedam colliganda sunt ut* sq.[1]
**seruitudo* 328. 10. Only one doubtful passage of Livy is cited earlier.

[1] In 684. 22 the change from *colligenda* to *colliganda* is as easy as Hartel's (*Index*) suggestion of *putamina*, and gives better sense. It is the converse of *aperiendum uulnus est* in the other passage (247. 19), and an allusion to Cyprian's favourite metaphor of the falsely healed wound, though here the whole body of the Church, and not the individual Christian, is wounded. If *putamina* be read, how could the gathering up of branches already lopped inflict further damage upon the tree?

Verbal nouns in *-tor* are :—

†*adulator* = 'deceiver' 745. 17. This, and not flatterer, must be the sense, and so probably also in 618. 1 *semper adulator ut fallat*; pleonasm is to be expected in Cyprian. Georges has this sense for *adulatio* from Quint. and Amm. Marc., but not for *adulator.* It occurs as the equivalent of ὑποκριτής in the fragmentary Latin translation of the Didache; see the Prolegomena to Harnack's edition, p. 278.

**delictor* 720. 17, Paucker, *Suppl.* cites Commod. *Instr.* 53 (ii. 11. 5 Dombart), Hieron., Aug.

**inpugnator* 615. 6, 689. 4. Cf. Paucker, *Nachträge*, p. 21.

**munerator* 345. 1. Omitted by Georges; Salvian, Paul. Nol. (Paucker, *Subrelicta*).

occisor 734. 13. Plautus and Petilian (Georges).

palpator 13. 10. Plautus and Cassian, *Coll.* 10. 13 (Paucker, *Kl. Beitr.*).

Of the fourth and fifth declensions there are few words to be noticed. Cyprian has no such devotion to the fourth as has, for instance, Gellius.

†*congestus* 688. 2, see p. 271. Probably the dais on which were the altar and the seats for the clergy, but perhaps the assembly of clergy. No similar use seems to be cited.

†*ductus temporis longus* 576. 21. Nothing similar seems to be cited.

†*potentatus improbus* = 'exercise of power,' 'tyranny,' 588. 5. Another strange use is 340. 21.

primatus (pl.) = 'birthright' 411. 3, 798. 7. This must be the Old Latin reading of Gen. 25. 31, &c., cf. Tert. *De Ieiun.* 17, Ambr. *Ep.* 63. 99. The Vulgate has *primogenita.* It is not noticed by Rönsch or Georges.

§ 34. Adjectives, strange in form, or strangely used, are common :—

†*abhorrens* = 'repulsive' 569. 20; not in Georges, and no other example given in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 4. 285.

†*alienus sensus* = 'insane' 681. 12. Georges only cites Firm. *Math.* 3. 6.

**balabundus* 602. 20. There can be no doubt of the reading, though the word occurs nowhere else. Cornelius (611. 3)

alludes to the passage, and corrects to *palabundus*, which Cyprian, with his love of synonyms, no doubt meant to write [1].

†*centenus fructus* = *centuplex* 832. 19. Georges only has Ven. Fort. 3. 9. 105 *centenus reditus* [2].

**cruciabundus* 670. 7, apparently another ἅπαξ λεγόμενον.

†*discissa aemulatio* 604. 14 = *schismatica*: cf. *scissus error* 599. 1. Both must be attempts to provide a Latin equivalent for a Greek adjective.

**elucidus* 598. 3. Not in Georges; but the reading is not quite certain.

†*expensa moderatio* 570. 20; cf. *pensius consilium* 649. 24.

**fluctuabundus* 255. 12. Ambr., Aug. (Georges) [3].

**indocibilis* 253. 2, if this be the true reading. Wrongly cited by Rönsch *It. V.* from Iren. 4. 28; it is in neither Stieren's nor Harvey's index to Irenaeus.

**inlapsa firmitas* 7. 3. Omitted by Georges.

†*inmerens* 256. 13 = 'guilty,' 'unworthy of reward'; not in Georges.

inpetrabilis et efficax sermo 271. 21. Plautus and Amm. Marc. Can this be an allusion to Jac. 5. 16 or Heb. 4. 12?

†*laudabilis* = 'laudatory'; 506. 8 *Nomen Dei laudabili testimonio praedicatur*, 598. 13 *delecti et ordinati et laudabili multorum sententia conprobati*, and similarly 629. 7, 20 [4]. *Laudabile testimonium* is simply for *laus*. No one seems to have noticed this sense.

**mensurnus* 571. 2, 585. 2. Novatian. *Trin.* 1, but apparently not earlier.

[1] Cf. Fronto, *Ad M. Caes.* 2. 12 (written by Marcus) *oues . . . palantes balantesque oberrant*. *Palabundus* also is very rare. In *Quod Id.* 10 (27. 14) it is borrowed from Tert. *Apol.* 21.

[2] Cf. 202. 15 *fructus cum centeno*, from which agricultural formula *centenus fructus* is derived; Cic. *Verr.* 3. 47 *ager efficit cum octauo, bene ut agatur, uerum, ut omnes dii adiuuent, cum decumo* (cited from Roby, *Latin Gr.* § 1883). In 763. 25 Cyprian uses *tricesimus, sexagesimus, centesimus* in the same sense, as in the Vulg. Mt. 13. 8; and in 202. 15, 832. 19 *sexagenarius fructus*.

[3] Beside the three *-bundus* forms given above, Cyprian has *gaudibundus* 831. 16 (Apul.) and *nutabundus* 5. 2 (literal in Apul., but not cited in Cyprian's metaphorical sense before Lact.); also the common forms *cunctabundus* 829. 22, *errabundus* 773. 1, *furibundus* 617. 20, *gratulabundus* 621. 9. The last is equivalent to *laetus*, as *gratulari* 691. 13 and often, *gratulatio* 615. 15 to *gaudere, gaudium*, for which cf. Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 367, *Beitr.* 1. p. 35

[4] Cf. Apul. *Flor.* 1. 9. 38 *utinam possem . . . praedicabili testimonio tuo ad omnem nostram Camenam frui*, i. e. *laude*.

pertinax = *crudelis*, 637. 20. Georges only cites for this sense Capit. *Macr.* 13. 3, but it also occurs in Sen. *Ep.* 104. 29 *M. Catonem recentiorem cum quo et infestius fortuna egit et pertinacius.* Cf. *pertinacia* 600. 2.

**semitonsus* 830. 6, and copied by Nemesianus 835. 15. For the subject cf. Friedländer's *Darst.* 3. 518, who only refers to this and Artemidorus, *Oneirocr.* 1. 21; Apul. *Met.* 9. 12 (162. 13 Eyss.) *capillum semirasi.*

separ 750. 4 *speciatim separes posuit.* Apparently the first example in prose; previously in the Silver poets only. Solinus and Priscian (Georges).

**septiformis* 53. 17, 338. 3. Aug., Ambr., &c.

**serpentinus* 431. 15, 806. 9; *De Aleatt.* 6 (A 98. 4). Aug., &c. Cf. Rönsch, *Collect.* 181, where is an instance, apparently literal, which may be earlier.

subtristis 498. 11. Ter., Amm. Marc., Hieron. (Georges).

†*uirginalis continentia* (of Cornelius, in the sense of Apoc. 14. 4) 629. 15. This seems the earliest example.

unanimis (never *unanimus*) 431. 5, 570. 6, 628. 21, 777. 13. In these Hartel gives no variant, but in 694. 16 and 754. 3 (the latter Biblical) the evidence is strong for *unianimis*, and the critical note to the latter passage leads to the suspicion that this may be the true reading elsewhere. For *unianimis* Georges has nothing earlier than the Scholia to Juvenal (5. 134), nor for *unanimis* than the Old Latin and Claudian; cf. Rönsch, *Collect.* p. 106. Cyprian has *semianimis* 595. 11 and 635. 19, and it is therefore more than probable that *exanime* should be read in 378. 1, not *exanimae.* Otherwise his constant adherence to *-animis* forms would be broken.

For adjectives used as substantives see p. 216. A few more may be given, and especially the names of the seasons, *hibernum*, *uernum*, *autumnum* 577. 14, 353. 1, 2[1], *magnalia* and *mirabilia* for miracles (see Hartel's *Index* and p. 245), *accidentia* 363. 21, cited only from Quint. *Decl.* and Amm.

[1] All these occur in Tertullian; see Oehler's *Index.* Amid all that has been written about them the Carthaginian mosaic *C. I. L.* 8. 12558, giving the names *autumnus, aestas, iemns, uernus,* does not seem to have been noticed. Nowhere else does *uernus* masc. occur. For the neuter cf. *diurna* (pl.) = *dies,* Cael. Aur. *Acut.* 2. 39. 228 (Georges). I have already suggested that 577. 14 may be a reminiscence of Virg. *Aen.* 1. 266.

Marc., *populares*='commons' 673. 16, which the dictionaries only cite from *Hist. Aug.*, Amm. Marc., and later Jct., though it already occurs in Tert. *Spect.* 3, *masculus*, always a substantive in Cyprian, 190. 13, 16, 203. 6, 468. 10, 473. 3, 22, 476. 2[1]. For the elliptical *dominicus* (*dies*), and *dominicum* and *sanctum* (*sacrificium*), see pp. 245, 266. A curious ellipse is 36. 20 *de diuinis fontibus inpleuimus modicum.*

§ 35. Of the pronouns little can be said without touching upon syntax. Generally speaking it may be said that his use of them is that of his age. *Hic* for *is*, *iste* (in Roman as well as in African writing) for *hic*, *ipse* for *idem* (cf. Sittl, *Lok. Verschiedenheiten* 115, Rönsch, *Beitr.* 2. 26), *alius* for *alter*, *quis* for *uter* were to be expected[2]. The rarity of *-met* forms (e.g. 226. 1 and 477. 16, where *semet* should surely be read instead of *se et*) is noticeable; *sese* is never used. Indefinite *quis* is widely and often strangely used; *Test.* 3. 25 *tit.*, 8. 5, 263. 3, 807. 12, &c. *Quidam* (cf. Petschenig in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 6. 268 for the use in Amm. Marc.) is constantly used for *sunt qui*, *nonnulli*; 297. 7, 616. 18, 722. 1, &c. *Quisque* and *quicumque* are often used for *quiuis* (see Hartel's *Index*, and for *quicumque* add 799. 15 (Stephanus) and 809. 16), but the chief use of *quisque* is of course for *quicumque*, which, in the classical use, is rare. *Quidquid*, however, is always used, and never *quidque* in this sense. *Quisquis* is rare (add 12. 11, *Sent.* 18). *Quispiam*, *quiuis*, *quilibet* are, I think, never used. *Singuli*, with and without *quique*, is a favourite substitute for *omnes*; *unusquisque* also is common. *Eiusmodi* stands alone for *talis*, and more rarely as an attribute; 219. 5, 225. 15, 241. 4, 468. 4, 694. 15, &c., but is not frequent. *Huiusmodi* is very rare, perhaps only in 226. 1. Kalb, *Roms Juristen*, p. 108, notes that *huiusmodi* does not prevail till after Papinian in legal Latin.

To express reciprocation Cyprian uses *inuicem*, I think, nineteen times; with an accusative *Test.* 3. 9 *tit.*, 408. 13,

[1] *Mares* only 10. 10. It had probably died out of the spoken language.

[2] Hartel's *Index* is by no means complete in these respects.

427. 17, 643. 6, 668. 8; a genitive 695. 3; dative 217. 22, 240. 24, 243. 8 (706. 2 shows that this is dative), 501. 9, 689. 12, 712. 1, 733. 10; ablative (*separare, recedere ab inuicem*) 364. 18, 475. 23, 476. 9, 711. 18. The only other prepositions so used are *aduersum* 278. 13, and *cum* 650. 16. *Utrubique* (for which Haussleiter in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 5. 565 suggests *utrumque*), 695. 4, *mutuo* 677. 2 (cf. 689. 12), and *in unum* 678. 9 are isolated instances; *alterutrum* 799. 17 is a citation from Stephanus. Reflexive pronouns alone are used for reciprocation 240. 24, 712. 4, and similarly a personal pronoun 508. 17. Beside these may be mentioned 645. 21 *alius pro altero*, 699. 17 *unusquisque pro altero*[1].

§ 36. Cyprian is more bold in the use of verbs than in that of nouns, and the number of new and rare forms is somewhat large. But it is in their syntax, with which this paper is not concerned, that he is most original and inventive.

abalienari = 'wander in mind' 289. 23. Haussleiter in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 1. 870 cites only this and two isolated Biblical readings, Jerem. 23. 7 (Wirceb.) and Mc. 4. 19 (Colbert.).

**abigeare* 773. 1. Though *abigeator* and *abigeatus* (n.) occur, this verb does not seem to recur even in glosses.

**amoenare* 4. 1. Cassiod., Salvian, &c.

circumcursare 683. 22. Plaut., Ter., Lucr., Lact., &c.

†*clarificare* 679. 4 *clarificato die*. There seems to be nothing like this.

†*coagulare* (metaphorical) 226. 18 *coagulati cum isdem simul ad audaciam*.

contestari = *declarare*; in citations of Scripture as 192. 22 *contestans ait*, 758. 14, &c.; with acc. inf. often 309. 18, 360. 26, 588. 11 (double acc.), 740. 23, &c., and with *quod* 634. 8; with acc. 270. 1 *contestari peccata*, 692. 10 *merita*, 222. 13, &c.; with acc. also in the Roman *Epp*. 551. 2, 559. 15. It

[1] No grammatical paper could be more admirable than Thielmann's on this subject in the *Archiv*, 7. 343 ff. He says that *inuicem* occurs about twenty times in Cyprian, the classical *inter se* once. This is an oversight, for it actually occurs in the Roman *Ep*. 36 (575. 6), if it be the true reading. Other noteworthy instances of reciprocation not written by Cyprian are 335. 16, 530. 11, 554. 5, 575. 8, 637. 1, 810. 6, 811. 1, 814. 7, 836. 1.

is Biblical with acc. inf. (e.g. 1 Pet. 5. 12), but does not occur in the Vulgate with an acc. of the thing attested, nor in Cyprian with a personal object (*contestor uos*) as is usual in the Vulgate. Jerome seems the first writer after Cyprian freely to use the word as he does. Aug. and Ambr. appear to avoid it. In the strange *contestantes ei* 731. 18 both case and pronoun seem to be chosen simply for rhyme.

dilucidare: 589. 2 *dilucidata ueritate.* This must be the reading, as in Tert. *Marc.* 3. 23 *init.*; cf. Paucker's *Ergänzungen I.*

euirare (literal) 10. 10. Varro, Catullus, Arnob. 5. 42 (211. 23 Reiff.).

gratulari=laetari; add 8. 16, 545. 6, 588. 12, 641. 10, 740. 17, cf. Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 367, and Dante, *Parad.* 24. 149. *Gratulatio* 615. 15, *gratulabundus* 621. 9, in the same sense; cf. *gratulanter* in Paucker, *Addenda.*

†*laxare* (*pacem*, &c. *alicui*), add 625. 16, 637. 21, 638. 8, 16. I can find no parallel.

leuare; 630. 18 *cum multo patientius et tolerabilius audiret* (Decius) *leuari aduersum se aemulum principem quam constitui Romae Dei sacerdotem.* The only resemblance seems to be 2 Esdr. 6. 6 *et leuare te uelis super eos regem.*

†*limare*, see Hartel's *Index.* The meaning seems to be to form a decision, not to enquire into a proposal; e.g. 596. 25, where otherwise would be an awkward ὕστερον πρότερον.

lucrari=effugere (*manus carnificis*, &c.) 306. 23, 342. 3, 619. 12; cf. *lucrum* 312. 27. Apul. *Met.* 8. 12 (142. 12 Eyss.), Amm. Marc. 19. 4. 3, Victor Vit. 3. 26 (84. 22 Petsch.); so *lucri facere* in *Bell. Hisp.* 36. 1, Tert. *Res. Carn.* 42, &c., and *lucratio* Tert. *Test. An.* 4 (139. 17 Reiff.).

†*portare*; (1) *Christum hominem portabat* of the Incarnation; see p. 248. This phrase is Cyprian's own; it is not in Tertullian or Irenaeus, and does not seem to be adopted by later writers[1]. (2) *Portare typum, figuram*, &c., see p. 254;

[1] Cf. *baiulare* in Iren. 5. 19. 1 *sua propria eum* (*Dominum*) *baiulante conditione, quae baiulatur ab ipso*, though the sense is different. Father Puller, S. S. J. E., has pointed out to me the use of *portare* in Iren. 5. 18. 1 *Pater conditionem simul et Verbum suum portans*, and that it is only another step (though Irenaeus does not seem to take it) to speak of the Church being borne by the Word. Irenaeus prefers *recapitulare* in this connexion, as in 5. 20. 2. Tertullian has *specie hominis quam erat gestaturus* in *Adu. Marc.* 4. 22, and *gestare* also *ib.* 34 and *Carn. Xti* 10, &c. *Gestabat* for *portabat* is the

this again seems peculiar to Cyprian. (3) *Portare peccata*, in the usual Christian sense.

†*praeformare* = *praefigurare* 217. 4. Nothing like it is cited.

propagare = *crescere* 7. 19 *immundos spiritus . . . incremento poenae propagantis extendere*, copied in *Quod Id.* (25. 7). It seems to be intransitive, and synonymous with *incremento*; so Léonard, who gives no parallel[1].

**quaestionare* 732. 2. Absent in the Vatican Fragments of Jurisprudence, from which Georges cites it.

recalcitrare = *rebellare* 423. 14. Bibl. (only Deut. 32. 15), Amm. Marc.

†*recreare* (of Baptism), see p. 264. Cyprian is the first to use it in this sense.

†*reparare* (*aliquem*) 273. 6, 362. 27, 373. 5, 394. 9, 400. 27 and (in *Ep.* 75) 821. 31. Cf. Min. Fel. 34. 12 (49. 24 Halm). Cyprian is the first to use this verb also of Baptism, and almost the first to use it with a personal object.

†*repraesentare* = *reddere* 542. 15, 596. 21, 808. 12; cf. Hartel's *Index* to Lucifer. Another strange use is 502. 13 *officium meum uestra diligentia repraesentet*, for which Greg. M. *Ep.* 1. 1 *nostra per eum repraesentetur auctoritas* (Lewis and Short) is the only parallel cited; yet cf. O. Ritschl, *Cyprian v. Carthago*, p. 11 ff. In ordinary senses the verb is very common, as it is in Seneca. Perhaps this is one of Cyprian's debts to him.

†*reseruare* = *saluare*, see p. 249. Also = *obseruare* (*legem*, &c.) 284. 2, 513. 10, 713. 19.

†*satiare* = *abundanter addere* (Hartel) 755, 15. This and the similar passages from the *Vita* 8 and *Sing. Cler.* 8 seem to stand alone, while the sense of *adiuuare*, 377. 16, is quite isolated.

siccare intrans. 808. 8. Lact. 7. 3. 8, where Bünemann's instances from Apicius are copied by Georges.

†*solidare* (*fidem*, &c.) 494. 6, 579. 8. In other remarkable senses 304. 23, 318. 11, 675. 1, 712. 6, and in *Ep.* 75 (820. 27). Cyprian is not only the first but the boldest employer of this word in metaphorical senses. Lact., *Epit.* 66. 8, *Opif.*

reading of the Oxford MS. Bodl. Add. C. 15, of the beginning of the tenth century, in 711. 12. *Induere* in this sense is confined to *Quod Id.*, 28. 9, 31. 3.

[1] But could it be synonymous with *extendere*, describing further the use of the *eculeus*?

10. 9, imitates him. The passage in *Ep.* 75 is one of many signs that Cyprian had a hand in that letter.

**sordidare*; add 201. 5, 219. 21, 374. 24, 830. 3 (literal), and *Sent.* 42. Lact., Hieron. (*Ep.* 54. 16 as well as 107. 10, which is cited by Georges), Firm. *Math.*, &c.

†*sospitare* = *saluare* 188. 25, 211. 9. Enn., Pacuv., Plaut., Catull., Liv., &c., but very rare. This attempt of Cyprian's to enrich theological diction was unsuccessful; see p. 249.

**sportulare* 466. 12; ἅπ. λεγ.; see p. 274. It must mean to give, and not to receive, the *sportula*, as the dictionaries would have it.

subitare = 'take by surprise' 693. 15. The only other instances seem to be the *Vita*, § 15 (cvi. 17), and Apoc. 3. 3 (Primasius) *ueniam et subitabo aduentum meum.* Cf. *subitatio* in Sap. 5. 2, and *desubitare* Firm. *Math.* 3. 4. 6 (cited in Paucker, *Addenda*). See Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 3. 255 and 4. 586.

taxare = *indicare* 705. 19. So Tert. *Praescr.* 6, *Adu. Marc.* 4. 20, 27, though usually in Tert. it means to blame. This is its only occurrence in Cyprian, and is a sign that when *Ep.* 63 was written he was still under Tertullian's influence; cf. p. 199.

**turificare*: only the perf. part. *turificati* is used 624. 19. Cf. Paucker's *Ergänzungen II.*

†*uentilare honorem* 340. 9; cf. Juv. 1. 28; in the opposite sense 598. 14; *uentilare mendacia* 678. 12, as in Min. Fel. 28. 2, Tert., &c.; to spread a rumour 628. 18, 839. 14; add to Hartel's list 211. 3 (literal).

Beside these there are two possible readings which should be mentioned:—

dereputare 253. 12 *delicta nostra dereputemus* (S^1). The alliteration makes it the more probable.

exabundare, almost certainly in 353. 15, 411. 23; see Hartel's critical notes, and Quicherat's *Addenda*.

It is probable also that in 727. 21 there is a verb *gloriare* = *glorificare*, see p. 223.

---

augere intrans. 643. 2. Rönsch, *Beitr.* 3. 9 only cites Jerem. 22. 30 in Iren. 3. 29 and a gloss.

**coniacere* 475. 5. Cf. Paucker, *Ergänzungen I*[1].

[1] The other verbs of this form in Cyprian are *condolere* 521. 11, *congaudere*

manere = κοιμᾶσθαι 473. 3, 475. 21; = *habitare* 370. 8, 410. 22 (the latter pleonastic *habitare et manere*); see Rönsch, *Beitr.* 3. 57 f. for both senses.

---

animadvertere aliquem; add 839. 16 to Hartel's list, perhaps the earliest instances with a direct personal object; Fronto, p. 207 Naber, cited by Hartel, *peruerse facta animaduertit* is not to the point.

†*concludere* = 'choke' 256. 2, 357. 18; cf. 373. 17. Cited by Georges only from Palladius.

†*conlidere* intrans. 215. 8, and in the Roman *Ep.* 36 (573. 21). S. Brandt in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 8, p. 130 cites Lact. *Inst.* 2. 8. 31, *De Ira* 10. 25.

consistere (see Hartel's *Index*) in the present part. is constantly used in the Christian sense of sojourning, as in the newly-discovered translation of Clement, § 1, παροικῶν. This is not a Biblical usage[1]. Unless (as Harnack asserts) Clement was a translation of the second century, these instances in Cyprian may be the earliest. *Consistens* is also twice used for Cyprian's favourite *constitutus*; in *Ep.* 17 *tit* (521. 2) *fratribus in plebe consistentibus*, and 749. 13 *extra ecclesiam consistens*[2].

†*depromere* = 'publish,' 'proclaim' 239. 21, 309. 26, 400. 13, 427. 20, 727. 13. Nothing like this seems to be cited except Nazarius, *Pan.* 8.

dirigere litteras ad aliquem 514. 5, 516. 13, 519. 14, 600. 12, 606. 9, 715. 9, 731. 17. Cf. Wölfflin in his *Archiv*, 4. 100, who knows no example between the Muratorian canon (p. 10 b., 9 *epistulae autem Pauli quae a quo loco uel qua ex causa directae sint* sq.) and Jerome.

†*distribuere*; 277. 4 *exemplum discipulis suis distribuens* = *dans*; probably only chosen for the alliteration with *dis-*, without

620. 9, *conlaetari* 431. 23, *conmori* 341. 15, *conpati* 521. 10, *consepultus* 740. 21, and the Biblical *consurgere* 429. 5 (see 428. 22). All of these are used earlier than Cyprian; cf. Rönsch, *Collect.* 245.

[1] The use in the *Acta* of Cyprian by the proconsul Paternus (cx. 28) is the usual one; cf. Mayor's Appendix to his Juvenal, p. 390, on 3. 296.

[2] *Constitutus in, inter,* &c. = καθεστώς, &c., has been so fully and so well discussed by Kalb and others that there is no need to dwell upon it here. It is, of course, by no means peculiar to Cyprian. I may refer to a note which I have contributed to the edition of the Vulgate by Wordsworth and White on Joh. 5. 13.

thought of the appropriateness of the word; cf. 394. 6 *contribuens pro terrenis caelestia,* which also simply means giving.

†*incurrere supplicia, incommoda* 342. 4, 364. 24. Lact., Arnob., &c.: see Bünemann on Lact. 2. 7. 23.

†*obtendere* 254. 8 *quid caeci oculi paenitentiae iter non uident quod obtendimus?* This must be in the sense of *ostendere,* for which perhaps it is only an error. Nothing like it seems to occur elsewhere.

†*offerre*: *oblati praefectis* 840. 12, and *Acta* § 3 (cxii. 12).

praeligere 577. 1. This very rare word is only cited from Apul. *Met.* 7. 11 (123. 25 Eyss.), and Tert. *Ad Nat.* 1. 14 (a false reference in Oehler). But can it be discriminated from *prae-eligere?* Cf. Rönsch, *It. V.* 210, Paucker, *Ergänzungen II,* and Engelbrecht in *Sitzungsber.* of the Vienna Academy, vol. 110, on Claud. Mamertus.

†*proponere* = *edicere* 284. 15, and cf. 682. 16; *proponere edictum* Novatian in *Ep.* 30 (551. 10), Tert. *Pud.* 1.

statuere = *sistere* 249. 13, 355. 25, 424. 3. Arnob. 1. 50 (34. 16 Reiff.), where Hildebrand only cites Cyprian; but cf. Rönsch, *Beitr.* 3. 77 for Plautus and Propertius.

struere = *instruere* 598. 5; cf. Rönsch, *It. V.* 380, and *Beitr.* 3. 78, where he cites from Haupt an inscription given in *Spicil. Solesm.* which copies 249. 13 (*v. s.*) with *struatur* for *statuatur*[1]. If this reading be accepted, Cyprian's will be the earliest instance in the sense of *obstruere.*

†*transpungere*: *transpunctae mentis alienatione dementes* 261. 17. In this metaphorical sense of stricken, synonymous with *alienatio* and *demens,* Cyprian seems to be the first to use the verb, which is cited also from Cael. Aur., though *transpunctio* 261. 12, is biblical.

**exambire* 528. 2, 630. 11, 739. 22, with different constructions. Arnob. 3. 24, 7. 15, onwards.

ignire (literal) 339. 1. This was probably in Cyprian's Bible in 2 Macc. 7. 3 (Vulg. *succendi*); *aurum ignitum* 384. 10 is Biblical; see *ib.* 6 and Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 156.

---

[1] This reading, and in 238. 8 *quam nos laetos excipit* from the same source (Haupt, *Opusc.* 3. p. 202) are very tempting; but *de oc mundo* for *de proelio* show that the latter at any rate is only a paraphrase. The change, of course, was necessary in the case of a natural death, but when one change was made another might easily be admitted.

The only impersonal verb which appears first in Cyprian is :—

**horret* 781. 18 *nec delectat id dicere quod aut horret aut pudet nosse.* This does not seem to be cited elsewhere; was it improvised by Cyprian for uniformity with *pudet* [1]?

Present participles used as substantives are not common: *aemulantes* = *aduersarii* 598. 14, *audientes* (see p. 263), *blandiens* = quack 570. 1, *commeantes* 746. 14, *confitentes* 615. 5, *credentes* (see p. 255), *delinquentes* 743. 4, *uenientes* = προσήλυτοι (see p. 263). *Discens* for *discipulus* seems to be absent.

§ 37. Adverbs are used in extraordinary abundance, but not many seem to be new :—

**deuote* = 'loyally' 513. 9. Lact., &c.

†*plane* = *certe, nimirum, utique,* but never, I think, for *perspicue, aperte,* as Hartel would have it in some instances. Add to his instances 338. 15, 748. 22, 776. 14 [2].

Cyprian, like Apuleius, delights in adverbs in *-im* :— [3]

glomeratim 479. 10. *Aetna* 199, Macr. *Sat.* 6. 4. 3 (where Jan has no note) onwards.

**speciatim* 750. 4; seven times in the *Hist. Aug.*, see Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 149, and Paucker, *Nachträge*, p. 24.

[1] *Oportet* in Cyprian is always, except perhaps in 385. 12, used in the stronger sense of *necesse est*; the usual meaning being supplied by *conuenit*, &c.

[2] Cyprian also uses the rare forms *consulte* 475. 20, *exerte* 420. 11 (meaning clearly, not energetically; a sense omitted by Georges, though used also by Tertullian), *inlicite* 643. 2, 757. 6, *secrete* 268. 23. He has no new forms in *-o*; for *festinato, iterato, uero* = *uere*, see Hartel's *Index*.

[3] *Statim* in 229. 26, 250. 21, and 811. 6 (*Ep.* 75) is used in the sense of 'necessarily,' as in Sen. *Ep.* 45. 10. *Interim* must mean 'at once' in 475. 24, 636. 7, 647. 14; it usually has the sense of 'for the present,' or 'for a time,' as 244. 13, 659. 18. The other adverbs of this form used by Cyprian are *confestim* 542. 15, *gregatim* 541. 3, *nominatim* 516. 3, 12, *oppidatim* and *ostiatim* 598. 21, 22, *passim* often (in the sense of 'indiscriminately,' 269. 4), *priuatim* 271. 5, 512. 19, and in *Ep.* 75 (816. 21), *singillatim* 271. 4. Beside these *saltim* or *saltem* is used with *nec* or *non* instead of *ne . . . quidem* (cf. Sittl in *Jahresber.* 1892, p. 235) in 241. 14, 242. 11, 360. 9, 402. 25, 826. 8; without a negative, only 14. 12 and 604. 15.

The following in *-ter* are noteworthy :—

granditer five times; see Hartel's *Index*. Only two earlier instances of this adverb are cited from Ovid, and 1 Esdr. 9. 7 from *Cod. Tolet.* (Rönsch, *It. V.* p. 150.)

**inseparabiliter* 215. 11, 22, 278. 2. Lact., Hieron., Aug.

**saeculariter Test.* 3. 36 *tit.* Aug., Prosper.

†*subtiliter fallens* 289. 20; cf. *subtilitas* in Rönsch, *Beitr.* 1. 68; in the usual sense 782. 21.

Derived from present participles are :—

†*exultanter* 614. 11, 691. 9.

**gubernanter* 608. 10. Omitted by Georges.

ignoranter 701. 16, 715. 3; only Vulg. (Old Latin) Ecclus. 14. 7; Rufinus, Aug.

indesinenter 733. 20. Vulg. only Heb. 10. 1. Lucifer, Hieron., &c.

**urgenter* 676. 14 and in the Roman *Ep.* 36 (573. 4). Aug.

Of temporal adverbs and conjunctions the rarity of *saepe* has already been noticed on p. 220. The same has been noted by Wölfflin in Cassius Felix; but Cyprian never uses the comparative or superlative of *frequenter*; *saepius* and *saepissime* are always used. *Iugiter*, also as in Cassius Felix, alternates with *semper*. *Mox* is never used; its place is taken by *cito* or *uelociter* [1]. The strange use of *retro* for 'in future' occurs in 366. 13. *Tunc* is always used, and never *tum*.

There is less to be said about local words. *Exinde*, rare in this sense, occurs 841. 13, 15; *istic*, *istinc* always mean 'here' and 'hence,' and with *illic*, *illinc* are constantly used of Carthage and Rome [2]. *Istic* for *istuc* 616. 11, but *illuc* 725. 15. *Nusquam* is put strangely for *nequaquam* in 394. 26, and the curious form of question *ubi erit quod* . . . ? occurs several times, as 601. 10 *ubi erit quod discimus ?*, 634. 20, 793. 12, 15; so in *Ep.* 75 (824. 17) and in Roman *Epp.* 551. 22, 562. 15, 564. 6.

[1] *Mox* in the Vulgate is confined to six examples, five of which are in books not revised by Jerome.

[2] For the pleonastic *illinc ab urbe*, &c., see p. 238. Here may be mentioned the attributive use of *illic*, *istic*, and *quondam*, indexed by Hartel; add to these *postmodum* 375. 14, *semper* 241. 23, and perhaps *statim* 505. 14. In *Ep.* 75 occur *retro* 816. 25, and *foris* 822. 11.

Fortasse (239. 6, 307. 18), *fortassis* (475. 8 and in the Roman *Ep.* 31, 558. 7) and *forsitan* (254. 2 and fairly often), are all used, as in Apuleius; cf. Becker, *Stud. Apul.* p. 11.

Among negatives *haud* is absent, though common in the artificial style of Arnobius. *Neue* is also absent, being replaced by *neque, et* or *aut*; once *ne . . . uel ne* 500. 14, and twice probably *ne . . . ne* in co-ordinate clauses, 588. 3[1], 688. 16. *Non* forming one notion with the word connected, adjective, adverb, &c. is characteristic of Cyprian; *non salubriter* 195. 16, *non de eius sententia ordinati* = *contra* 672. 16, *de non colentibus* 361. 11, &c. *Necdum* and *neque enim* have quite taken the place of *nondum, non enim*; hence *et necdum, necdum quoque* 593. 8, 801. 4, *neque enim et* 688. 10. But irregular negatives are countless.

Of irregularly used copulative conjunctions some examples have been given on pp. 230, 239. It may be stated as a general rule that *et* connects clauses, *ac* words. *Item* is excessively common. *Aut . . . aut* is used for *et . . . et* or *tam . . . quam* in 240. 14, 548. 5, 673. 20, and often, though *uel . . . uel* is normal in this sense, 356. 19, &c. The comparative particles are *tantum . . . quantum* or *in tantum . . . in quantum*; *tam . . . quam, hoc . . . quo* and *tanto . . . quanto* are rarer[2]. But the most noteworthy and almost the most common of Cyprian's usages are those of *et* for *sed* or *tamen* either at the beginning or in the middle of a sentence. Only once is it used between words, not clauses, 283. 2, unless *et* be read in 586. 2; but such expressions as 263. 11 *distribuendum per apostolos totum* (all they had) *dabant et non talia delicta redimebant* and 366. 12 are of constant occurrence. Conversely *sed et* in similar positions, well, though not completely, indexed by Hartel, is frequently used for *et*.

[1] Hartel once, 588. 3, reads *neue*, but the text is doubtful, and it seems better to read *ne . . . ne* as suggested above.

[2] *Quam amplior . . . tam maior* 14. 21. *Quantum . . . tantum* with positive adj. 262. 16, 584. 10. Other instances are 490. 8, 505. 2, 546. 22. For *in tantum . . . in quantum* and variants see Hartel *s. vv. in* and *quantus*. *Quanto* with *tanto* omitted 189. 17.

Of adversative conjunctions, *immo*, in various positions, is very common [1]. *Porro* also is frequent, always initial and usually with *autem* [2]. *At* (*at enim* 301. 7, *at uero* 651. 24) appears to be almost extinct. For *sed enim* see Hartel's *Index*. *Ceterum* is very common at the beginning of periods in a strongly adversative sense. *Certe* is always initial (227. 16, 601. 8, &c.), and used not for restriction, but for assertion. *Ergo* is apparently used for *tamen* in a conversational passage, 307. 18, as it is in *Sent.* 4 (438. 3).

Nisi si is constantly used with the indicative in a *reductio ad absurdum*, as 382. 20; only 334. 8, 496. 15 in another sense with the subjunctive. *Si* is strangely used for *quod* in 249. 23, 468. 7, 740. 17. *Dum* is often used, and invariably with the present indicative, as a causal particle; *dummodo* perhaps only 779. 12 [3].

In the place of the old conclusive particles, *hinc*, *inde*, *unde* are almost always used. *Propter quod* and *et idcirco* are much more common than *quamobrem*, *quare* or *quapropter*, though all these occur; *quocirca* is absent. *Denique* in several senses —for instance, 'in consequence,' 'accordingly,' and as a simple copula—rarely in that of 'finally,' is very common [4], e.g. 421. 23, 501. 1, 618. 4, 700. 11.

Probably no writer has used *quominus* so freely as Cyprian in all connexions; e.g. 260. 3, 297. 11, 411. 9, 502. 18. Final *ut*, as has been said, is rare unless strengthened with *ad hoc*, *propter hoc*, &c. But the use of *ut* as simply explanatory or consecutive is a marked feature in his style; 195. 23, 312. 21, 26, 522. 15, 794. 18, &c.

Clauses with *quia*, *quod*, *quoniam* for the acc. inf. are, of

[1] It is used for *potius*; *nemo cogitet . . . sed immo consideret* 334. 3, and 219. 22.

[2] *Porro autem* = 'on the contrary' 797. 8; cf. Rönsch, *Beitr.* 2. 78.

[3] The combinations of *dum*, &c. are often curious; *dum . . . sic* 743. 16, 772. 5, *sic . . . dum* 605. 1, *hinc . . . dum* 423. 9, *inde . . . dum* 422. 17, *eo . . . dum* 212. 3, *inde . . . quod* or *quia* 362. 30, 408. 9, 667. 20, 798. 7.

[4] Cf. Kalb, *Roms Juristen*, p. 19 f., Becker, *Stud. Apul.* p. 32, Rönsch, *Beitr.* 2. 65.

course, common in a writer of the third century, and most of them have been indexed by Hartel.

§ 38. The most remarkable part of Cyprian's syntax is that of prepositions, which must be omitted here. He avoids both archaic and vulgar forms; several which are common in such writers as Fronto and Tertullian, and used by other writers in Cyprian's correspondence, are absent. The following are not used:—*absque* (but *abs* 253. 24, 676. 11), *cis*, *citra*, *clam* (though *coram* is used as a preposition, and *palam* as an adverb), *erga* and *ergo*, *penes*, *pone*, *prae*, *secus*, *subter*, *tenus*, *usque* and *adusque*[1]. *Trans* is confined to the formula *trans mare constituti* 592. 22, 601. 3; *ex* and *ob* are comparatively rare, while *apud* has an extraordinary extension of meaning.

The following ablatives are used with the genitive as substitutes for prepositions:—*beneficio* 385. 21[2], *causa* 659. 27, *fraude* 769. 12, *merito* (cf. Sittl, *op. cit.* p. 135), 711. 4, *respectu* 510. 5. To these should perhaps be added *fide* 281, 4, 303. 3, 357. 16, 370. 12, and *ui* 302. 16, 305. 16.

There is little to be said about exclamations. *Utinam* 517. 15, &c. is varied thrice by the poetical *o si* 10. 24, 361. 18. 685. 6; except in 253. 23, where there is the accusative, *o* is followed by the nominative 14. 1, 9, &c. *Pro dolor* occurs 9. 12, 243. 19, *pro nefas* 199. 10, 242. 10. *Oro, quaeso, puta*, are used without construction, as in other writers.

[1] *Usque ad* 256. 16, 401. 26, 402. 6, 503. 10, 764. 3; *ad finem usque* 503. 7.

[2] Cyprian may have learnt this use from Seneca, who has it frequently. *Dial.* 5. 2. 1 &c. It is also used by Apuleius, *Met.* 5. 25, 8. 20 (93. 15, 147, 6 Eyss.) and Ps.-Apul. *Ascl.* 31 (54. 12 Goldbacher), and by Lucianus 533. 7. Sittl, *Lok. Verschied.*, p. 136, strangely seems to regard it as African, and the instance in the *Vita* (A. c. 10) as the earliest. At any rate he quotes no other. See also Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 8. 590.

TEXTUAL SUGGESTIONS.

INDEX.

SELECT LIST
OF
Standard Theological Works
PRINTED AT
THE CLARENDON PRESS, OXFORD.

1. THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, ETC.

HEBREW, etc. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis.* By G. J. Spurrell, M.A. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

—— *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel.* By S. R. Driver, D.D. 8vo. 14s.

—— *Treatise on the use of the Tenses in Hebrew.* By S. R. Driver, D.D. *Third Edition.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

—— *The Psalms in Hebrew without points.* Stiff covers, 2s.

—— *A Commentary on the Book of Proverbs.* Attributed to Abraham Ibn Ezra. Edited from a MS. in the Bodleian Library by S. R. Driver, D.D. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 3s. 6d.

—— *The Book of Tobit.* A Chaldee Text, from a unique MS. in the Bodleian Library; with other Rabbinical Texts, English Translations, and the Itala. Edited by Ad. Neubauer, M.A. Crown 8vo. 6s.

—— *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,* with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by Francis Brown, D.D., S. R. Driver, D.D., and C. A. Briggs, D.D. Parts I—III. Small 4to. 2s. 6d. each. Part IV, *In the Press.*

HEBREW, etc.—*Hebrew Accentuation of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job.* By William Wickes, D.D. 8vo. 5s.

—— *Hebrew Prose Accentuation.* By the same Author. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

—— *The Book of Hebrew Roots,* by Abu 'l-Walîd Marwân ibn Janâh, otherwise called Rabbî Yônâh. Now first edited, with an appendix, by Ad. Neubauer. 4to. 2l. 7s. 6d.

ETHIOPIC. *The Book of Enoch.* Translated from Dillmann's Ethiopic Text (emended and revised), and edited by R. H. Charles, M.A. 8vo. 16s.

GREEK. OLD TESTAMENT. *Vetus Testamentum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum.* Accedit potior varietas Codicis Alexandrini. Tomi III. 18mo. 18s.

GREEK. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, including the Apocryphal Books.* By the late Edwin Hatch, M.A., and H. A. Redpath, M.A. Parts I—III, 4to, 21*s.* each. Part IV, *In the Press.*

—— *Essays in Biblical Greek.* By Edwin Hatch, M.A., D.D. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive, Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta.* Edidit Fridericus Field, A.M. 2 vols. 4to. 5*l.* 5*s.*

—— NEW TESTAMENT. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Antiquissimorum Codicum Textus in ordine parallelo dispositi. Accedit collatio Codicis Sinaitici. Edidit E. H. Hansell, S.T.B. Tomi III. 8vo. 24*s.*

—— *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Accedunt parallela S. Scripturae loca, etc. Edidit Carolus Lloyd, S.T.P.R. 18mo. 3*s.*

On writing paper, with wide margin, 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Appendices ad Novum Testamentum Stephanicum,* jam inde a Millii temporibus Oxoniensium manibus tritum; curante Gulmo. Sanday, A.M., S.T.P., LL.D. I. Collatio textus Westcottio-Hortiani (jure permisso) cum textu Stephanico anni MDL. II. Delectus lectionum notatu dignissimarum. III. Lectiones quaedam ex codicibus versionum Memphiticae Armeniacae Aethiopicae fusius illustratae. Extra fcap. 8vo, cloth. 3*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Novum Testamentum Graece juxta Exemplar Millianum.* 18mo. 2*s.* 6*d.* On writing paper, with wide margin, 7*s.* 6*d.*

GREEK. *The Greek Testament,* with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version:—

(1) Pica type, with Marginal References. Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

(2) Long Primer type. Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

(3) The same, on writing paper, with wide margin, 15*s.*

—— *The Parallel New Testament, Greek and English;* being the Authorised Version, 1611; the Revised Version, 1881; and the Greek Text followed in the Revised Version. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament.* By C. E. Hammond, M.A. *Fifth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

—— *A Greek Testament Primer.* An Easy Grammar and Reading Book for the use of Students beginning Greek. By E. Miller, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

LATIN. *Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Latina, cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica.* Edidit B. Thorpe, F.A.S. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Old-Latin Biblical Texts:* No. I. The Gospel according to St. Matthew, from the St. Germain MS. (g_1). Edited with Introduction and Appendices by John Wordsworth, D.D. Small 4to, stiff covers, 6*s.*

—— *Old-Latin Biblical Texts:* No. II. Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew, from the Bobbio MS. (k), etc. Edited by John Wordsworth, D.D., W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., and H. J. White, M.A. Small 4to, stiff covers, 21*s.*

LATIN. *Old-Latin Biblical Texts:* No. III. The Four Gospels, from the Munich MS. (q), now numbered Lat. 6224 in the Royal Library at Munich. With a Fragment from St. John in the Hof-Bibliothek at Vienna (Cod. Lat. 502). Edited, with the aid of Tischendorf's transcript (under the direction of the Bishop of Salisbury), by H. J. White, M.A. Small 4to. stiff covers, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine, secundum Editionem S. Hieronymi. Ad Codicum Manuscriptorum fidem recensuit Iohannes Wordsworth, S.T.P., Episcopus Sarisburiensis. In operis societatem adsumto Henrico Iuliano White, A.M. 4to.

Fasc. I. *Euangelium secundum Mattheum.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Fasc. II. *Euangelium secundum Marcum.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Fasc. III. *Euangelium secundum Lucam.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

OLD-FRENCH. *Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Gallica e Cod. ms. in Bibl. Bodleiana adservato, una cum Versione Metrica aliisque Monumentis pervetustis.* Nunc primum descripsit et edidit Franciscus Michel, Phil. Doc. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

ENGLISH. *The Holy Bible in the Earliest English Versions,* made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers: edited by Forshall and Madden. 4 vols. Royal 4to. 3*l.* 3*s.*

Also reprinted from the above, with Introduction and Glossary by W. W. Skeat, Litt. D.

The Books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The New Testament. 6*s.*

ENGLISH. *The Holy Bible, Revised Version*.*

Cheap Editions for School Use.

Revised Bible. Pearl 16mo, cloth boards, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Revised New Testament. Nonpareil 32mo, 6*d.*; Brevier 16mo, 1*s.*; Long Primer 8vo, 1*s.* 6*d.*

* The Revised Version is the joint property of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

—— *The Oxford Bible for Teachers,* containing the Holy Scriptures, together with a new, enlarged, and illustrated edition of the *Oxford Helps to the Study of the Bible,* comprising Introductions to the several Books, the History and Antiquities of the Jews, the results of Modern Discoveries, and the Natural History of Palestine, with copious Tables, Concordance and Indices, and a series of Maps. Prices in various sizes and bindings from 7*s.* 6*d.* to 2*l.* 2*s.*

—— *Helps to the Study of the Bible,* taken from the *Oxford Bible for Teachers.* Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

—— *The Psalter, or Psalms of David, and certain Canticles,* with a Translation and Exposition in English, by Richard Rolle of Hampole. Edited by H. R. Bramley, M.A. With an Introduction and Glossary. Demy 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

—— *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica.* Essays in Biblical and Patristic Criticism, and kindred subjects. By Members of the University of Oxford.

Vol. I. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. III. 8vo. 16*s.*

ENGLISH. *The Book of Wisdom:* the Greek Text, the Latin Vulgate, and the Authorised English Version; with an Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and a Commentary. By W. J. Deane, M.A. 4to. 12*s.* 6*d.*

GOTHIC. *The Gospel of St. Mark in Gothic,* according to the translation made by Wulfila in the Fourth Century. Edited, with a Grammatical Introduction and Glossarial Index, by W. W. Skeat, Litt. D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4*s.*

2. FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, ETC.

St. Athanasius: *Orations against the Arians.* With an account of his Life by William Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

—— *Historical Writings, according to the Benedictine Text.* With an Introduction by W. Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

St. Augustine: *Select Anti-Pelagian Treatises, and the Acts of the Second Council of Orange.* With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

St. Basil: *The Book of St. Basil on the Holy Spirit.* A Revised Text, with Notes and Introduction by C. F. H. Johnston, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Canons *of the First Four General Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.* With Notes by W. Bright, D.D. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Catenae *Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum.* Edidit J. A. Cramer, S.T.P. Tomi VIII. 8vo. 2*l.* 4*s.*

Clementis Alexandrini *Opera, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii.* Tomi IV. 8vo. 3*l.*

Cyrilli *Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas.* Edidit P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi II. 8vo. 2*l.* 2*s.*

—— *in D. Joannis Evangelium.* Accedunt Fragmenta Varia necnon Tractatus ad Tiberium Diaconum Duo. Edidit post Aubertum P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi III. 8vo. 2*l.* 5*s.*

—— *Commentarii in Lucae Evangelium quae supersunt Syriace.* E mss. apud Mus. Britan. edidit R. Payne Smith, A.M. 4to. 1*l.* 2*s.*

—— The same, translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 14*s.*

Ephraemi Syri, *Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni, Balaei, aliorumque Opera Selecta.* E Codd. Syriacis mss. in Museo Britannico et Bibliotheca Bodleiana asservatis primus edidit J. J. Overbeck. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Eusebii Pamphili *Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV.* Ad Codd. mss. recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi IV. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

—— *Evangelicae Demonstrationis Libri X.* Recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi II. 8vo. 15*s.*

—— *contra Hieroclem et Marcellum Libri.* Recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. 8vo. 7*s.*

Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, according to the text of Burton, with an Introduction by W. Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Evagrii *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ex recensione H. Valesii. 8vo. 4*s.*

Irenaeus : *The Third Book of St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, against Heresies.* With short Notes and a Glossary by H. Deane, B.D. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

Patrum Apostolicorum, *S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, quae supersunt.* Edidit Guil. Jacobson, S.T.P.R. Tomi II. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Reliquiae Sacrae *secundi tertiique saeculi.* Recensuit M. J. Routh, S.T.P. Tomi V. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 1*l.* 5*s.*

Scriptorum *Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula.* Recensuit M. J. Routh, S.T.P. Tomi II. 8vo. 10*s.*

Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History*, according to the Text of Hussey, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Sozomeni *Historia Ecclesiastica.* Edidit R. Hussey, S.T.B. Tomi III. 8vo. 15*s.*

Tertulliani *Apologeticus adversus Gentes pro Christianis.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by T. Herbert Bindley, B.D. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

——— *de Praescriptione Haereticorum : ad Martyras : ad Scapulam.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by T. Herbert Bindley, B.D. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Theodoreti *Ecclesiasticae Historiae Libri V.* Recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

3. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ETC.

Baedae *Historia Ecclesiastica.* Edited, with English Notes, by G. H. Moberly, M.A. *New edition in the Press.*

Bigg. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria;* being the Bampton Lectures for 1886. By Charles Bigg, D.D. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church, and other Works.* 10 vols. 8vo. 3*l.* 3*s.*

Bright. *Chapters of Early English Church History.* By W. Bright, D.D. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12*s.*

Burnet's *History of the Reformation of the Church of England. A new Edition.* Carefully revised, and the Records collated with the originals, by N. Pocock, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Cardwell's *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England;* being a Collection of Injunctions, Declarations, Orders, Articles of Inquiry, etc. from 1546 to 1716. 2 vols. 8vo. 18*s.*

Councils *and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland.* Edited, after Spelman and Wilkins, by A. W. Haddan, B.D., and W. Stubbs, D.D. Vols. I and III. Medium 8vo, each 1*l.* 1*s.*

Vol. II, Part I. Medium 8vo, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II, Part II. *Church of Ireland; Memorials of St. Patrick.* Stiff covers, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Fuller's *Church History of Britain.* Edited by J. S. Brewer, M.A. 6 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 19*s.*

Gibson's *Synodus Anglicana.* Edited by E. Cardwell, D.D. 8vo. 6*s.*

Hamilton's (*Archbishop John*) *Catechism,* 1552. Edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by Thomas Graves Law, Librarian of the Signet Library, Edinburgh. With a Preface by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. Demy 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Hussey. *Rise of the Papal Power, traced in three Lectures.* By Robert Hussey, B.D. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

John, *Bishop of Ephesus. The Third Part of his Ecclesiastical History.* [In Syriac.] Now first edited by William Cureton, M.A. 4to. 1*l.* 12*s.*

—— *The same,* translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 8vo. 10*s.*

Le Neve's *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae.* Corrected and continued from 1715 to 1853 by T. Duffus Hardy. 3 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Noelli (A.) *Catechismus sive prima institutio disciplinaque Pietatis Christianae Latine explicata.* Editio nova cura Guil. Jacobson, A.M. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

Records of the Reformation. *The Divorce,* 1527–1533. Mostly now for the first time printed from MSS. in the British Museum and other Libraries. Collected and arranged by N. Pocock, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 16*s.*

Reformatio *Legum Ecclesiasticarum.* The Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws, as attempted in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth. Edited by E. Cardwell, D.D. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Shirley. *Some Account of the Church in the Apostolic Age.* By W. W. Shirley, D.D. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stillingfleet's *Origines Britannicae,* with Lloyd's Historical Account of Church Government. Edited by T. P. Pantin, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 10*s.*

Stubbs. *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum.* An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. By W. Stubbs, D.D. Small 4to. 8*s.* 6*d.*

4. ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

Bradley. *Lectures on the Book of Job.* By George Granville Bradley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Lectures on Ecclesiastes.* By G. G. Bradley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Bull's *Works, with Nelson's Life.* Edited by E. Burton, D.D. 8 vols. 8vo. 2*l.* 9*s.*

Burnet's *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles.* 8vo. 7*s.*

Butler's *Works.* 2 vols. 8vo. 11*s.*

Comber's *Companion to the Temple; or a Help to Devotion in the use of the Common Prayer.* 7 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

Cranmer's *Works.* Collected and arranged by H. Jenkyns, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College. 4 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Enchiridion Theologicum *Anti-Romanum.*

Vol. I. Jeremy Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, and Treatise on the Real Presence. 8vo. 8*s.*

Vol. II. Barrow on the Supremacy of the Pope, with his Discourse on the Unity of the Church. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. III. Tracts selected from Wake, Patrick, Stillingfleet, Clagett, and others. 8vo. 11*s.*

Greswell's *Harmonia Evangelica. Fifth Edition.* 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

Hall's *Works.* Edited by P. Wynter, D.D. 10 vols. 8vo. 3*l.* 3*s.*

Heurtley. *Harmonia Symbolica: Creeds of the Western Church.* By C. Heurtley, D.D. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Homilies *appointed to be read in Churches.* Edited by J. Griffiths, M.A. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hooker's *Works*, with his Life by Walton, arranged by John Keble, M.A. *Seventh Edition.* Revised by R. W. Church, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's, and F. Paget, D.D. 3 vols. medium 8vo. 1*l.* 16*s.*

—— *the Text* as arranged by J. Keble, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 11*s.*

Jackson's (Dr. Thomas) *Works.* 12 vols. 8vo. 3*l.* 6*s.*

Jewel's *Works.* Edited by R. W. Jelf, D.D. 8 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Martineau. *A Study of Religion: its Sources and Contents.* By James Martineau, D.D. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15*s.*

Patrick's *Theological Works.* 9 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Pearson's *Exposition of the Creed.* Revised and corrected by E. Burton, D.D. *Sixth Edition.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Minor Theological Works.* Edited with a Memoir, by Edward Churton, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 10*s.*

Sanderson's *Works.* Edited by W. Jacobson, D.D. 6 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacrae.* 2 vols. 8vo. 9*s.*

—— *Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion;* being a vindication of Archbishop Laud's Relation of a Conference, etc. 2 vols. 8vo. 10*s.*

Wall's *History of Infant Baptism.* Edited by H. Cotton, D.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Waterland's *Works*, with Life, by Bp. Van Mildert. *A new Edition*, with copious Indexes. 6 vols. 8vo. 2*l.* 11*s.*

—— *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, with a Preface by the late Bishop of London. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Fuller's *Church History of Britain.* Edited by J. S. Brewer, M.A. 6 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 19*s.*

Gibson's *Synodus Anglicana.* Edited by E. Cardwell, D.D. 8vo. 6*s.*

Hamilton's (*Archbishop John*) *Catechism*, 1552. Edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by Thomas Graves Law, Librarian of the Signet Library, Edinburgh. With a Preface by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. Demy 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Hussey. *Rise of the Papal Power, traced in three Lectures.* By Robert Hussey, B.D. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

John, *Bishop of Ephesus. The Third Part of his Ecclesiastical History.* [In Syriac.] Now first edited by William Cureton, M.A. 4to. 1*l.* 12*s.*

—— *The same,* translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 8vo. 10*s.*

Le Neve's *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae.* Corrected and continued from 1715 to 1853 by T. Duffus Hardy. 3 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Noelli (A.) *Catechismus sive prima institutio disciplinaque Pietatis Christianae Latine explicata.* Editio nova cura Guil. Jacobson, A.M. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

Records of the Reformation. *The Divorce,* 1527–1533. Mostly now for the first time printed from MSS. in the British Museum and other Libraries. Collected and arranged by N. Pocock, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 16*s.*

Reformatio *Legum Ecclesiasticarum.* The Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws, as attempted in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth. Edited by E. Cardwell, D.D. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Shirley. *Some Account of the Church in the Apostolic Age.* By W. W. Shirley, D.D. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stillingfleet's *Origines Britannicae,* with Lloyd's Historical Account of Church Government. Edited by T. P. Pantin, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 10*s.*

Stubbs. *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum.* An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. By W. Stubbs, D.D. Small 4to. 8*s.* 6*d.*

4. ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

Bradley. *Lectures on the Book of Job.* By George Granville Bradley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Lectures on Ecclesiastes.* By G. G. Bradley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Bull's *Works, with Nelson's Life.* Edited by E. Burton, D.D. 8 vols. 8vo. 2*l.* 9*s.*

Burnet's *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles.* 8vo. 7*s.*

Butler's *Works.* 2 vols. 8vo. 11*s.*

Comber's *Companion to the Temple;* or a Help to Devotion in the use of the Common Prayer. 7 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

Cranmer's *Works.* Collected and arranged by H. Jenkyns, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College. 4 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Enchiridion Theologicum *Anti-Romanum.*

Vol. I. Jeremy Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, and Treatise on the Real Presence. 8vo. 8*s.*

Vol. II. Barrow on the Supremacy of the Pope, with his Discourse on the Unity of the Church. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. III. Tracts selected from Wake, Patrick, Stillingfleet, Clagett, and others. 8vo. 11*s.*

Greswell's *Harmonia Evangelica. Fifth Edition.* 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

Hall's *Works.* Edited by P. Wynter, D.D. 10 vols. 8vo. 3*l.* 3*s.*

Heurtley. *Harmonia Symbolica: Creeds of the Western Church.* By C. Heurtley, D.D. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Homilies *appointed to be read in Churches.* Edited by J. Griffiths, M.A. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hooker's *Works,* with his Life by Walton, arranged by John Keble, M.A. *Seventh Edition.* Revised by R. W. Church, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's, and F. Paget, D.D. 3 vols. medium 8vo. 1*l.* 16*s.*

—— *the Text* as arranged by J. Keble, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 11*s.*

Jackson's (Dr. Thomas) *Works.* 12 vols. 8vo. 3*l.* 6*s.*

Jewel's *Works.* Edited by R. W. Jelf, D.D. 8 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Martineau. *A Study of Religion: its Sources and Contents.* By James Martineau, D.D. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15*s.*

Patrick's *Theological Works.* 9 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Pearson's *Exposition of the Creed.* Revised and corrected by E. Burton, D.D. *Sixth Edition.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Minor Theological Works.* Edited with a Memoir, by Edward Churton, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 10*s.*

Sanderson's *Works.* Edited by W. Jacobson, D.D. 6 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacrae.* 2 vols. 8vo. 9*s.*

—— *Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion;* being a vindication of Archbishop Laud's Relation of a Conference, etc. 2 vols. 8vo. 10*s.*

Wall's *History of Infant Baptism.* Edited by H. Cotton, D.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Waterland's *Works,* with Life, by Bp. Van Mildert. *A new Edition,* with copious Indexes. 6 vols. 8vo. 2*l.* 11*s.*

—— *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist,* with a Preface by the late Bishop of London. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Wheatly's *Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer.* 8vo. 5s.

Wyclif. *A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif.* By W. W. Shirley, D.D. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Wyclif. *Select English Works.* By T. Arnold, M.A. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

—— *Trialogus.* With the Supplement now first edited. By Gotthard Lechler. 8vo. 7s.

5. LITURGIOLOGY.

Cardwell's *Two Books of Common Prayer,* set forth by authority in the Reign of King Edward VI, compared with each other. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 7s.

—— *History of Conferences on the Book of Common Prayer from* 1551 *to* 1690. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Gelasian Sacramentary. *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae.* Edited, with Introduction, Critical Notes, and Appendix, by H. A. Wilson, M.A. Medium 8vo. 18s.

Hammond. *Liturgies, Eastern and Western.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Liturgical Glossary, by C. E. Hammond, M.A. New edition, by F. E. Brightman, M.A., *In the Press.*

An Appendix to the above, crown 8vo, paper covers, 1s. 6d.

Helps to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer. Being a Companion to Church Worship. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Leofric Missal, The, as used in the Cathedral of Exeter during the Episcopate of its first Bishop, A.D. 1050–1072; together with some Account of the Red Book of Derby, the Missal of Robert of Jumièges, &c. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by F. E. Warren, B.D., F.S.A. 4to, half-morocco, 1l. 15s.

Maskell. *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England,* according to the uses of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor, and the Roman Liturgy arranged in parallel columns, with preface and notes. By W. Maskell, M.A. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 15s.

—— *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae.* The occasional Offices of the Church of England according to the old use of Salisbury, the Prymer in English, and other prayers and forms, with dissertations and notes. *Second Edition.* 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

Warren. *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church.* By F. E. Warren, B.D. 8vo. 14s.

Oxford
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON: HENRY FROWDE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.